

THE  
EVANGELICAL  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LXVII.

---

JULY, 1866.

---

ARTICLE I.

BAPTISM: THE DOCTRINE SET FORTH IN HOLY SCRIPTURE, AND TAUGHT IN THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

By Prof. CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D. D., Philadelphia.

OUR Lord, in the course of his earthly ministry, authorized his disciples to baptize, (John 4: 1, 2) and previous to his ascension, commanded them to make disciples of all the nations, by baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, (Matt. 28: 19.) The rite of Baptism thus enjoined by our Lord, has been the subject of various disputes in the Christian world. It is the object of this article to exhibit the faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in regard to the points of dispute.

Over against all who deny the divine institution and perpetuity of Baptism, our Church maintains that "God has instituted it," and that it is obligatory and necessary throughout all time (Aug. Conf., Art. V, VII, VIII, IX, XIII,

VOL. XVII. No. 67 40

XIV,) so that without it the Church cannot exist in the world.

Serious differences of opinion, however, exist in Christendom; even among those who recognize the perpetuity and obligation of Baptism, as to what is *essential* to Baptism; even as to its outward part. For, while all are agreed that the use of water, and of the Word, are essential, some parts of the Christian world maintain that the essential idea of Baptism, is that of the *total immersion* of the body, insomuch that this *immersion is absolutely necessary, and positively demanded by our Lord*, and the application of water in any other way, whatsoever, is no Baptism. **THE LUTHERAN CHURCH DOES NOT HOLD that immersion is ESSENTIAL TO BAPTISM.**

*Luther and the Jewess.*

Attempts have, indeed, been made to show that Luther, at least, held the necessity of immersion, and that the Lutheran Church either held it with him, or was inconsistent in rejecting it.

One of the passages most frequently appealed to, in the attempt to implicate Luther, is found in Walch's Edition of his works, X, 2,637. In regard to this, the following are the facts:

1. The passage referred to is from a letter of Luther, written from Coburg, July 9th, 1530, in reply to an Evangelical pastor, Henry Genesius, who had consulted him in regard to the Baptism of a Jewish girl.

It will be noted from the date, that the letter was written a few months after the issue of the Catechisms, in which it is pretended, as we shall see, that he taught the necessity of immersion.

2. The letter given in Walch, is also in the Leipzig edition of Luther, (XXII, 371,) and is not in the original language, but is a translation, and that from a defective copy of the original. The original Latin is given in De Wette's edition of Luther's Briefe, (IV, 8,) and contains a most important part of a sentence which is not found in the German translation. The letter in Walch cannot, therefore, be cited in evidence, for it is neither the original, nor a reliable translation of it.

3. The whole letter shows that the main point of inquiry was not as to whether the girl should be baptized in this or

that mode, but what precautions decency demanded during the baptism, provided it were done by immersion.

4. Luther says, "It WOULD PLEASE me, therefore, that she should \* \* \* modestly have the water POURED UPON HER, (*Mihi placaret, ut, \* \* \* uerecunde perfunderetur*) or, if she sit in the water up to her neck, that her head should be immersed with a trine immersion." (*Caput ejus trina immersione immergeretur.*)

5. An *immersionist* is one who contends that Baptism *must* be administered by immersion. The passage quoted is decisive that Luther did not think Baptism *must* be so administered. He represents it as pleasing to him, best of all, that the girl should have the water applied to her by pouring, or that, if she were immersed, greater precautions, for the sake of decency, should be observed, than were usual in the Church of Rome. It is demonstrated by this very letter, that LUTHER WAS NOT AN IMMERSIONIST.

6. In suggesting the two modes of Baptism, Luther was simply following the Ritual of the Romish Church. In the Romish Ritual the direction is: "Baptism may be performed either by pouring, immersion, or sprinkling; but either the first or second mode, which are most in use, shall be retained, according as it has been the usage of the Churches to employ the one or the other, so that either THE HEAD OF THE PERSON to be baptized shall have a trine ablution—that is, either the water shall be POURED UPON IT, (*perfundatum*—Luther quotes the very word,) or the HEAD shall be immersed, (*ut trina ablutione caput immergatur*)—Luther again quotes almost verbatim.

In the Romish Ritual, furthermore, for the baptism of adults, it is said, "But in the Churches where Baptism is performed by immersion, either of the *entire body*, or of the head only, the priest shall baptize by thrice immersing *the person*, or his head," (*illum vel caput ejus.*) Luther directed, in case the Jewess were immersed at all, that the officiating minister should immerse her head only. She was to seat herself in the bath, and the only religious immersion was not that of her whole body, (as Rome permits, and the Baptists, if consistent, would prescribe); but of her *head* only, (*ut caput ejus immergeretur.*) Luther, so far as he allowed of immersion at all, was not as much of an immersionist as the Ritual of Rome might have made him, for he does not hint at the immersion of the *whole body* of the Jewess by the minister. An immersionist contends that the *whole body*

must be submerged by the officiating minister; not indeed that he is to lift the whole body and plunge it in, but the whole immersion is to be so conducted as to be clearly his official work, the person being led by him into the water, and the immersion completed by his bending the body and thus bringing beneath the surface what was up to that time uncovered. Luther preferred, if there was to be an immersion, that the *head* only, not the *body*, should be immersed by the minister, (*not illum sed caput ejus.*) Even to the extent, therefore, to which he allowed immersion, *Luther was no immersionist.*

7. If Luther could be proved by this letter to be an immersionist, it would be demonstrated that he derived his view from the Romish Church, and held it in common with her. In like manner, the Church of England, the Episcopal Churches of Scotland and of the United States, and the Methodist Churches, would be carried over to the ranks of immersionists, for they allow the different modes. But these Churches are confessedly not immersionist; therefore, *Luther was no immersionist.*

8. Whatever Luther's personal preferences may have been as to mode, he never even *doubted* the validity of Baptism by pouring. But immersionists do not merely doubt it, they absolutely deny it; therefore, *Luther was no immersionist.*

9. An immersionist is one who makes his particular mode of Baptism a term of Church communion, and an article of faith. Luther was in a Church which did not prescribe immersion as necessary—never made it an article of faith; therefore, *Luther was no immersionist.*

10. Finally, the letter of Luther shows that he *preferred* pouring. He says expressly that it would please him that the water should be poured upon her, and gives this the first place; and his directions in regard to the immersion, are given only in the supposition that that mode might be decided upon—"if she sit, &c., her head shall be immersed," &c., *si sedens.*

Whatever, therefore, may be the difference between the doctrine of the necessity of immersion, and the "doctrine of immersion," we feel safe in affirming that Luther held neither.

#### *Luther's Catechisms.*

From Luther's Larger Catechism, by confounding the very plain distinction between allowance, or preference of a mode,

and a belief in its necessity, the evidence has been drawn that our Confessions teach the Baptist doctrine of immersion.

Yet this very Catechism, in express terms, repudiates any such doctrine, and acknowledges, in the most decisive manner, what the Baptist doctrine denies—the validity of other modes than immersion. Mark these two sentences from the Larger Catechism: “Baptism is not our work, but God’s. For thou must distinguish between the Baptism which God gives, and that which the keeper of a bath-house gives. But God’s work, to be saving, does not exclude faith, but demands it, for without faith it cannot be grasped. For in the mere fact that *thou hast had water poured on thee*, thou hast not so received Baptism as to be useful to thee; but it profits thee when thou art baptized with the design of obeying God’s command and institution, and in God’s name of receiving in the water the salvation promised. This neither the hand nor the body can effect, but the heart must believe.”\* In these words there is an express recognition of pouring or sprinkling, (for the word used by Luther covers both, but excludes immersion,) as modes of Baptism.

But there is another passage yet more decisive, if possible. “We must look upon our Baptism, and so use it, as to strengthen and comfort us, whenever we are grieved by sins and conscience. We should say: I am baptized, therefore, the promise of salvation is given me for soul and body. For to this end *these two things are done in Baptism*, that the body which can only receive the water, is wet by pouring, and that, in addition, the word is spoken that the soul may receive it.”† Here not only is the recognition of pouring (or sprinkling) explicit, but if the words were not compared with other expressions of Luther, it might be argued, that he and our symbols went to the opposite extreme from that charged upon them, and instead of teaching that immersion is necessary, denied its validity. So far, then, is the charge from being verified, that we are authorized to make directly the opposite statement. Luther and our Confessions repudiate, utterly, the Baptist doctrine of the *necessity* of immersion.

In the *original* of the Smaller Catechism there is not a

\* Catech. Maj. Müller, 490, 36, das Wasser über dich giessen. The Latin is, “*aqua perfundi*.”

† Do. 492. German: “*Der Leib begossen wird.*” Latin: “*Corpus aqua perfundatur.*”

word about immersion in a passage sometimes referred to. It is simply, "What signifies this *Water-Baptism?*" (*Wasser-Taüffen*.) "Immersion" is but a translation of a translation. The same is the case with the Smalcald Articles. The original reads, "Baptism is none other thing than God's word in the water, (*im wasser*)," and not a word about immersion. We do not rule these translations out because they at all sustain the allegation. Fairly interpreted, they do not; but we acknowledge the obvious rule accepted in such cases—that the originals of documents, and not translations of them, are the proper subjects of appeal.

A translation can carry no authority, except as it correctly exhibits the sense of the original. Even the general endorsement of a translation as correct by the author of the original, is not decisive, on a minute point which he may have overlooked, or have thought a matter of very little importance. A clergyman of our Church translated the commentary of an eminent German theologian, and received from him a warm letter of thanks, strongly endorsing the accuracy of the translation. Yet, not only in a possible deviation of the translation from the original, but in any matter of doubt, however slight, the original alone would be the source of appeal. As the Lutheran Church accepts Luther's version of the Bible, subject to correction by the original, so does she accept any translation of her symbols, however excellent, subject to correction by the original.

But, even if the principle were not otherwise clear, the facts connected with the translation of the different parts of the Symbolical Books, would be decisive on this point. The translation of the Smalcald Articles, made in 1541, by Generanus, a young Danish student of Theology, at Wittemberg, and who was an intimate friend of Luther, was confessedly admirable, pithy, and Luther-like, yet the translation which appeared in the Book of Concord, in 1580, was an *entirely new one*, very inferior to the old one, and this, after undergoing two sets of changes, is the one now ordinarily found in the Latin editions of the Symbol.

*This* is one of the translations to which appeal is made, in the face of the original, and language is used which leaves the reader under the impression that these articles were translated under Luther's eye, and the translation approved by him.

The German translation of the Apology, found in the *Editio Princeps* of the German Concordia, and in most other editions, adds some things which are not in the Latin, and

omits some things which are there. Which is the authority, Melanechthon's Latin, or Jonas' German, if a dispute arise as to the meaning of the *Apology*?

3. The Larger Catechism was first translated by Lonicer, faithfully, and into good Latin. The second translation was made by Oeopœus, and this was *changed* in various respects by Selnecker, and thus changed, was introduced into the Book of Concord.

4. The Smaller Catechism was first rendered into Latin by an unknown hand, then by Sauermann. "This translation *seems* to have been introduced into the *Concordien-buch*, but with changes," says Köllner.

The principle involved, which no honest scholar would try to weaken, is well stated by Walch, in these words:—"It is by all means proper to know what was the *original language* of each of our Symbolical Books, since it is manifest, that from *that, not from translations*, we are to judge of the genuine and true meaning of any book. What they teach, we ought to see, not in versions, but in the original language itself, especially where the matter or meaning seems involved in some doubt. Versions do not always agree entirely with the writings as their authors composed them; as the facts themselves show is the case in our Symbolical Books also."

The allusions of Luther to the outward mode are never found in his *definition* of Baptism. His allusions to immersion come, in every case, long after he has defined Baptism. His *definition* of Baptism, in the Smalcald Articles, is: "Baptism is none other thing than the word of God in the water, enjoined by his institution." His *definition* of Baptism in the Larger Catechism, is thus: "Learn thou, when asked, What *is* Baptism? to reply, It is not mere water, but a water embraced in God's word and command." It is a mere illusion of the devil when our New Spirits of the day ask, "How can a *handful* of water help the soul?" And then comes his powerful vindication of this "*handful* of water" in its connection with the word. In the Smaller Catechism, to the question, What is Baptism? the reply is, "Baptism is not mere water, but that water which is comprehended in God's command, and bound up with God's word." Nowhere does any Symbol of our Church say that Baptism is immersion, or even allude to immersion when it speaks of that which constitutes Baptism.

\* Introd. in Lib., Symbol, 61.

That the word "begießen," by which Luther indicates one of the modes of Baptism, can only indicate pouring or sprinkling, and by no possibility immersion, every one even moderately acquainted with German, very well knows. The proper meaning of *begießen*, as given by Adelung is, "Durch *Giessen* nass machen," i. e., to wet by pouring or dropping. Campe's definition is, "Durch *Darangießen einer Flüssigkeit nass machen*," i. e., to wet by the pouring on of a fluid. Frisch defines it: *Perfundī, affundendo madefacere*," i. e., to pour over, to wet by pouring upon. The Grimms define it by, "*Perfundere*," to pour over. When followed by "mit," governing a noun, the "mit" is always to be translated "with," "mit wasser begießen," to wet by pouring the water. When followed by "auf," the "auf" means "upon." When Adler gives "moisten," "bathe," "soak," and similar words as an equivalent, it is in such phrases as, "to bathe or moisten (*begießen*) the hand with tears." You may use "begießen," when the hand is bathed by the tears which pour or drop upon it; but if the hand were bathed by immersing it in water, a German would no more use "begießen" to designate that act than we would use "pour." We affirm what every German scholar knows, that with any allusion, direct or indirect, to the mode in which a liquid can be brought into contact with an object, "begießen" never means, and never can mean, either in whole or inclusively, "to immerse." It is so remote from it as to be antithetical to it, and is the very word used over against the terms for immersion, when it is desirable distinctly to state that Baptism is not to be performed in that way. But if "begießen" could ever mean to immerse, or include that idea, we shall demonstrate specially that it has not that force in Luther's German.

Luther uses the word *giessen* upwards of fifty times in his translation of the Bible, and invariably in the primary sense of pour. The word "begießen" in which the prefix "be" simply gives a transitive character to the "giessen,"—as we might say "bepour," he uses five times. Twice he uses it in the Old Testament, to translate "Yah-tzak," which in twenty other passages he translates by "giessen," to pour. The two passages in which *begießen* is used, are, Gen. 35:14, "Jacob poured (*begoss*) oil thereon,"—hardly, we think, immersed his pillar of stone in oil; Job 38:38, "Who can stay the bottles of heaven, when the dust groweth (Marg: Hebr: is poured, *begossen*) into hardness,"—hardly meaning

that the compacting of the mire is made by immersing the ground into the showers. Three times Luther uses "*begießen*" in the New Testament, 1 Cor. 3: 6, 7, 8, "Apollos watered: he that watereth (*begossen, begeusst*)—referring to the sprinkling, or pouring of water on plants. So Luther also says, "Hatred and wrath are poured over me, (*über mich begossen,*)" Jena Ed., 5: 55.)

We have shown that the general usage of the language does not allow of the interpretation in question. We have shown that, if it did, Luther's German does not. We shall now show, that if both allowed it any where, it is most especially not allowable in the Catechism, nor in Luther's use of it any where, with reference to Baptism.

Now for "*begießen*," in its reference to Baptism by Luther, in the Catechism and elsewhere, can it include not exclude immersion? Let us try this.

1. Larger Catechism: *Dass du lässt das Wasser über dich gießen, (quod te aqua perfundi sis.)* We affirm that these words have, to any one who knows any thing of German, but one possible meaning, and that, like the literal English translation of the words "that thou lettest the water pour over thee," the German cannot mean "thou lettest thyself be dipped into the water."

2. What mode of Baptism Luther had in his mind, is clear, furthermore, from the words in immediate connection with those we have quoted, for he says: "This (the work of the heart) the bent hand (*Faust\**) cannot do, nor the body," the connection showing the thought to be this: neither the bent hand of the administrator of Baptism, bent to gather up and pour the water, nor the body of the recipient, can take the place of faith, in securing the blessings of Baptism.

3. This is rendered clear again, from the words "*Was sollt ein hand voll Wassers der Seelen helfen?*" What can a handful of water help the soul? This shows that the "handful of water" was connected with a received mode at that time in the Lutheran Churches.

If the sense of *begießen*, as applied to Baptism, were obscure, (as it is not—no word more clearly excludes immersion) this passage would settle it.

4. But there is abundance more of evidence on this point.

\* As in Isaiah, 40: 12, "*Wer misset die Wasser mit der Faust?*" Eng. Ver.: "Who hath measured the water in the hollow of his hand?"

In Luther's Ritual for Baptism, the officiating minister "pours the water," (*geusst wasser auf,*) and says: "Ich taufe dich.

5. In the Article of Torgau, the fanatics, who in the Catechism are characterized as asking, "What can the handful of water do," are represented as calling Baptism "miserable water, or pouring," (*Begiessen.*)

6. In the letter of July 9th, 1530, "That standing, she should have the water poured upon her, (*perfunderetur*) or sitting, her head should be immersed, (*immergeretur,*)" surely not both the same.

7. In the Wittenberg Liturgy, of 1542, those are spoken of who do "not dip (*tauchen*) the infants in water, nor (*noch*) pour it upon them, (*begiessen.*)"

But Luther says, *the body* is baptized; therefore, of necessity it is urged, by immersion. When St. Paul describes Baptism in the words "having our bodies washed with pure water," he can hardly be said to prove himself an immersionist. Luther's words are: "These two things are done in Baptism, that the body, which is able to receive nothing besides the water, is wet by pouring, and, in addition, the Word is spoken, that the *soul* may embrace it. Body and soul are the two things in Luther's mind, and it is not hard to see that the body does receive what is poured on the head.

But if the criticism of the word "body," stood, it would do no good, for water can be applied to the entire body, by pouring or sprinkling, as was largely, though not universally, the usage in our Church.

Luther, in speaking of the permanence of the Baptismal Covenant, and of the power of returning, by repentance, to its blessings, even after we fall into sin, says: "Aber mit Wasser ob man sich gleich hundertmal lasset ins Wasser senken, ist doch nicht mehr denn Eine Taufe." This has been thus translated and annotated: "But no one dares to 'begiessen' us with water again: for if one should be sunk in water (*ins wasser senken*) a hundred times, it is no more than one Baptism?" Here *senken* is used along with *begiessen*, and to explain it.

But neither the translation, nor interpretation, is accurate. "*Darf*" does not mean "dares," but means "needs," as the Latin has it, "*non est necesse.*" The "*ob gleich*" has been dropped, those important words, which the Latin properly renders "*etsi*," "for even though one should be sunk." "*Senken*" is not used to explain *begiessen*. Luther does not

mean that to "pour upon with water" is equivalent to being "sunk in water a hundred times." The point is this: After the one Baptism, the repentant sinner needs not that water should be poured upon him again. No re-pouring can make a re-baptism. Nay, if he were not merely *poured* upon, but *sunk* into the water, not once but a *hundred* times, still, in spite of the quantity of the water, and the manifold repetition of the rite, there would be but one Baptism. There is an **ANTITHESIS**, not a **PARALLEL**, between **POUR** and **SINK**, and **ONCE** and a **HUNDRED TIMES**.

*Luther's Translation of the Bible.*

Luther's translation of the words connected with *Baptism*, proves that he was no immersionist.

1. Immersionists say that *Baptism* should *always* be translated *immersion*. Luther, throughout his translation of the Bible, *NEVER* translates it *immerseion*, (*untertauchung*) or *dipping*, (*eintauchung*) or *plunging*, (*versenkung*) but *always* and exclusively, *Baptism* (*Tauſe*).

2. Immersionists translate *Baptismos* immersion. Luther translates it either *Baptism* or *washing*. Mark 7:4,—Baptist Version: *Immersion* of cups, &c. Luther: *washing*. Do. 8,—Baptist Version: *immersions*; Luther: *washing*.

3. a. Immersionists say that *Baptiza* should always be translated to *immerse*. Luther *never* translates it by *immerse*, nor any of its equivalents, but with the exceptions we shall mention in a moment, by *Taufen*, to baptize.

b. Immersionists say, moreover, that *en* following *baptizo*, should be translated *in*, "I immerse you *in* water;" "he shall immerse you *in* the Holy Ghost," &c. Luther translates as does our English version: "I baptize you *with* (*mit*) water;" "he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost," &c.

c. Luther translates 1 Cor. 15:29, "What shall they do which are baptized *above* the dead," and explains it, (Leipz. Ed. X, 384,) of administering Baptism "*at the graves of the dead*," in token of faith in the resurrection. The words of Luther are: "They are baptized at the graves of the dead, in token that the dead who lay buried there, and *over whom* they were baptized, would rise again. As we also might administer Baptism publicly, in the common church-yard, or burial place." *Auslegung*, Anno 1584.

Immersionists generally prefer to consider the *Baptism* here as *metaphorical*, and *immerse* the *live saints* in *sorrows*.

4. Immersionists say that the *radical* idea of *Baptizo*, in its New Testament use, is not that of *washing*. Luther repeatedly translates it, *to wash*. We will present some of these translations in contrast: Translation on Immersionist principles: Judith 12:8, "Judith went out and *immersed* herself at a spring near the camp;" Luther: "and *washed* herself in the water." Ecclesiasticus 34:25,—Immersionist: "He that *immerses* himself after touching a dead body;" Luther: "That *washeth* himself." Mark 7:5—Immersionist: ("The Pharisees and all the Jews,) when they come from the market, unless they *immerse* themselves, eat not;" Luther: "wash themselves." Luke 11:38—Immersionist: "That he had not *immersed* himself;" Luther: "washed himself."

5. The Baptist version renders *Baptistes*, *immerse*; Luther, always *Tauffer, Baptist*.

6. Immersionists say that *Bapto* always properly means, to *dip*. Luther translates Rev. 19:13: "He was clothed with a vesture *sprinkled* with blood."

These proofs are enough to demonstrate that, judged as a translator, *Luther was no immersionist*.

But it has been urged that Luther has used *taufte*, where our translators have "dipped," 2 Kings, v. 14. The fact is, however, that this verse alone is enough to dispose of the false theory. Our translators have "dipped," it is true; but as Luther did not translate from our authorized version, that proves nothing. That same authorized version has "dipped" in Rev. 19:13, where Luther has "*besprenget*," "sprinkled." The fact is, that if the ravages in the German, on the part of those who are determined to make Luther a Baptist, or an Anabaptist, against his will, are not arrested, they will not leave a word in that language, once deemed somewhat copious, which will express any mode of reaching the human body by water, except by dipping; "*begießen*" and "*taufen*" are disposed of, and "*besprengen*" can be wiped out exactly as "*taufen*" has been.

The question, however is worth a moment's attention. Why Luther used the word "*taufte*," in 2 Kings, v. 14? The word "*ta-bhal*" is used sixteen times, but Luther never translated it "*taufen*," except in this place. It is also noticeable that in this place alone does the Septuagint translate "*ta-bhal*" by "*baptizo*." The Vulgate considers it as equivalent in meaning to "*ra-hhatz*," of the preceding verses, and translates it "*lavit*," washed. The Targum considers the two

words as equivalent. So does the Syriac, and so the Arabic. Paginus' version gives to both the same meaning, but marks the distinction between their form by translating "rahhatz" "lavo," and "ta-bhal" "abluo." In his Thesaurus, he gives as a definition of "ta-bhal," "lavare, baptizare," and translates it in 2 Kings, v. 14, "lavit se," washed himself.

Origen, and many of the Fathers, had found in the washing of Naaman a foreshadowing of Baptism. De Lyra, Luther's great favorite as an expositor, expressly calls this washing—2 Kings, v. 14—a receiving of Baptism. Luther saw in it the great idea of Baptism—the union of water with the word, as he expressly tells us, in commenting on the passage, in his exposition of the xxii. Psalm.\*. The word "taufe," therefore, is to be translated here, as everywhere else in Luther's Bible, not by immerse, but by "baptize." Naaman baptized himself, *not* dipped himself in Jordan, is Luther's meaning. The Hebrew, *tabhal*, Luther translates fourteen times, by *tauchen*, to dip, in accordance with its accepted etymology. But he also translates what he regarded as its participle, by color or dye, Ezek. 23:15. According to the mode of reasoning, whose fallacy we are exposing, wherever Luther uses "taufen," we may translates it "to dye;" for the etymological force of a word, according to this, is invariable, and all true translations of it must have the same meaning.

*Bapto* Luther translates by "tauchen and eintauchen," to dip, dip in; but he also translates it by "besprengen," (Rev. 19:13,) to sprinkle; but, according to this mode of reasoning, *tauchen* and *taufen* both being equivalents, *taufen* is sprinkling, and Baptism is sprinkling, and dipping is sprinkling. By the way in which it is proved that *Taufe* is immersion, may be proved that both *Taufe* and immersion are sprinkling. *Baptizo*, Luther never translated by *tauchen*, nor by any word which would be understood by the readers of his version to mean immersion. Whatever may be the etymology of *taufe*, its *actual use* in the German language did not make it equivalent to *immersion*. Sprinkling (*besprengen*) or pouring (*begießen*) were called *taufe*. If Luther believed that the *actual* (not the primary or etymological) force of the word made immersion necessary, he was bound before God and the Church to use an unambiguous term. It is not true that "*tauchen*" or "*eintauchen*" had, either

\* Leip. 3. Edit. V. 461.

then or now, that very trifling and vulgar sense, which it is alleged unfitted them over against "taufen," to be used to designate immersion. Luther uses them in his Bible, and, when in his liturgies, he means to designate immersion, these words are the very words he employs.

Luther used the ancient word *Taufen*, because, in the fixed usage of the German, *Taufen* meant, to baptize. Whatever may have been the etymology of it, we find its ecclesiastical use fixed before the ninth century. Otfried so uses it, A. D. 868. Eberhard and Maass, in their great *Synonymik* of the German, say: "After *Taufen* was limited to this ecclesiastical signification, it was no longer used for *Tauchen*, and can still less be used for it now, that *Taufen* (Baptism) is no longer performed by *Eintauchen* (immersion)."

The propositions which Luther used in connection with "taufen," show that he did not consider it in its *actual use* as a synonym of immerse: to baptize *with* water (*mit*) *with* the Holy Ghost, (*mit.*) John baptized *with* water, (*mit*); baptize *under* Moses (*unter*) *with* the cloud, (*mit.*) It is not English, to talk of immersing *with* water; nor would it be German to follow "tauchen" or "eintauchen" by "mit;" nor any more so to use "mit" after "taufen," if *taufen* meant to immerse.

Furthermore, Luther has twice, 1 Cor. 15:29, "To baptize *over* the dead," (*über,*) which he explains to refer to the baptism of adults over the graves of the martyrs.

But Luther has not left us to conjecture what he considered the proper German equivalent for *baptizo* and *baptismos*, in their *actual use*—how much their actual use settled as to the *mode of Baptism*. *Five* times only he departs from the rendering by *Taufe*, or *Taufen*, but not once to use "tauchen," but invariably to use *Wuschen*, to wash.

Judith 12:8: *Und wusch sich im Wasser*, washed herself, (Gr.: *Ebaptizeto*; Vulg.: *Baptizat se.*)

Sir. 34:30, (25:) *Wer sich wascht*, he who washes himself, (Gr.: *Baptizomenos*; Vulg.: *Baptizatur*;) what avails him this washing? *sein Waschen?* (Gr.: *Loutron.*)

Mark 7:24: *Ungewaschen (aniptois) Handen*—*sie waschen (nipsontai,)* *sie waschen sich (baptizontai,)* *tischen zu waschen (baptismous;)* 7:8: *Zu waschen (baptismous.)*

Luke 11:38: *Das er sich nicht vor dem essen gewaschen hatte (ebaptiste.)*

He translates *baptizo* as he translates *nipto* and *louo*.

Here is the demonstration, that while Luther believed, in

common with the great mass of philologists, that the *Etymological force* (*Laut*) of *baptismos* and *baptisma*, is "immersion," its actual force in biblical use is "washing," without reference to mode. Luther treats it as having the same *generic* force with *louo*, *pluno* and *nipto*, all of which he translates by the same word, *waschen*, just as our authorized version translates every one of them, *baptizo* included, by wash. With the etymology of the Greek goes also the etymology of the German. The primitive mode of washing, in nations of warm or temperate countries, is usually by immersion. Hence the words in many languages for the two ideas of dipping and washing come to be synonyms—and as the word washing ceases to designate mode, and is equally applied, whether the water be poured, sprinkled or is plunged in, so does the word which, etymologically, meant to dip. It follows the mutation of its practical equivalent, and comes to mean washing, without reference to mode. So our word, bathe, means, *primarily*, to immerse. But we now bathe by "plunge," "douch," or "shower-bath." If the baptismal commission had been given in English, and the word used was Bathe, the person who admitted that the word "bathe" covered all modes of applying water, but who, in a case confessedly a matter of freedom, would prefer immersion as the mode, because it corresponds with the *etymology* of bathe, as well as with its actual use, would do what Luther did in a cognate case, in 1519, of which we are about to speak; but the inference that either regarded the word in question as meaning to immerse, or as a synonym of it, would be most unwarranted.

#### *Luther's Etymologies of the Words.*

An attempt has been made to show that Luther was an Immersionist, by citing his views of the etymology both of the Greek and German words involved. The citation relied on for this purpose, is from the sermon: *Von Sacrament der Taufe*,\* which has been thus given: "Die taufe (baptism) is called in Greek, baptismus, in Latin, immersion, that is when any thing is wholly dipped (*ganz ins wasser taucht*) in water which covers it." Further, "according to the import of the word *Tauf*, the child, or any one who is baptized, (*getauft wird*) is wholly sunk and immersed (*sonk und tauft*) in water and taken out again: since, without doubt, in the German language, the word *Tauf* is derived from the word *Tief*, be-

\* Leipzig Edition, xxii, 139.

cause what is baptized (*taufet*) is sunk deep in water. This, also, the import of (*Tauf*) demands."

This translation is not characterized by accuracy. For example it renders both "*Laut*" and "*Bedeutung*," by the one word *import*, when Luther expressly distinguishes between "*Laut*" and "*Bedeutung*;" the former referring to the *etymological* or primary literal force of a word, and the latter to the moral significance of a rite.

Further, it mutilates and mistranslates the words, which, literally rendered, are: "Yet it should then be, and **WOULD BE RIGHT** (*und wär recht,*) that one sink and baptize entirely in the water, and draw out again, the child, &c." How different the air of Luther's German, from that of the inaccurate English.

There is another yet more significant fact. It **OMITS**, out of the very heart of the quotation, certain words, which must have shown that the idea that "*begießen*" includes immersion is entirely false. The two sentences which are quoted, are connected by these words, which are **NOT QUOTED**: "And although in many places it is no longer the custom to plunge and dip (*stossen und tauchen*) the children in the font, (*die Tauf,*) but they are poured upon (*begeusst*) with the hand, out of the font (*aus der Tauf.*)" Here over against immersion, as the very word to mark the opposite mode, is used that "*begießen*," which we have seen referred to immersion. It seems to us inconceivable that any one could read the passage in the original, without having the falsity of the former position staring him in the face.

On the whole passage we remark:

First, That the sermon was published in 1519, among the earliest of Luther's writings, ten years before the Catechism; and when he had not yet made the originals of Scripture the subject of his most careful study, and when his views were still largely influenced by the fathers and Romish theology. It was published five years before he began his translation of the New Testament, and more than twenty before he gave his Bible its final revision. This raises the query whether his views, after the thorough study of the Bible, connected with his translating it, remained unchanged. We have given, and can give again, ample proof that if Luther's meaning in 1519, implies the necessity of immersion, his opinion had undergone a total change before 1529, when the Larger Catechism, whose words are in question, was published.

Secondly, The passage is not pertinent to the proof of that for which it is urged. Luther designs to give what he supposes to be the *etymological* force of *Baptismos* and *Taufe*—not to show their force in *ACTUAL USE*.

That Luther affirms not that *Baptismos* and *Taufe* in actual use mean "immersion," but only *etymologically*, is clear. 1. From the whole vein of argument. As an argument concerning the etymology of the words, it is pertinent; as an argument on the actual use of either, it would be in the highest degree absurd. 2. From his limitation by the word "*Laut*" which means "*Etymology*," as Luther himself translates it in the Latin, "*Etymologia*." 3. By the fact that twice in these very sentences, Luther uses *Taufe* not in the sense either of immersion or of *Baptism*, but of "*font*." 4. That in his translation of the Scriptures he uses "*Taufe*" for "*Baptism*," without limitation to mode. 5. That in his translation of the Romish Ritual, and wherever else he wishes to indicate the idea of immersion, he never uses *taufe* or *taufen*, always *tauchen* or *untertauchung*. 6. That in the only Baptismal Service properly Luther's own, he directs the water to be poured, with the words, *Ich taufe*. 7. That he repeatedly recognizes the validity of *taufe* by pouring, which would be ridiculous, if *taufe* in actual use meant immersion.

Third. The Latin of Luther's Sermon on Baptism, in the Jena Edition, which excludes every thing of his which was not officially approved, makes very plain the drift of the words quoted. It says: "The noun, *Baptism*, is Greek, and can be rendered (*potest verti*,) in Latin, *Mersio*,"—"That" (*i. e.*, the immersion and drawing out) the *etymology* of the word (*Etymologia nominis—Laut des Wörtleius*) seems to demand (*postulare videtur*.) From Luther's opinion on the etymology of the words *Baptism* and *Taufe*, the inference is false that he held that *Baptism*, in the *ACTUAL USE* of the word, meant immersion, and that the German word *Taufe* in *ACTUAL USE* had the same meaning. To state the proposition is to show its fallacy to any one familiar with the first principles of language.

1. That the etymological force and actual use of words are often entirely different every scholar knows. *Carnival* is, etymologically, a farewell to meat. *Sycophant*, etymologically and properly, means a fig-shower; *miscreant* is a misbeliever; *tinsel* means "sparkling," (*Thetis* with the "*tinsel*—

slippered feet," Milton;) Carriage (Acts 21:15,) means things carried; kindly, (in the Litany,) according to kind; painful, involving the taking of pains; treacle, something made from wild beasts. The German *schlecht*, bad, originally meant good; *selig*, blessed, is the original of our English word silly; the word courteous has its root in a word which meant a cow-pen.

3. The very essence of the philological argument against the necessity of immersion, turns upon this fact. If to admit that *Bapto* and *Baptizo* may, etymologically, mean to dip in, is to admit that, in their **ACTUAL USE**, they mean exclusively to dip in, then the argument against the Baptists is over.

3. The English words Baptism and baptize, are simply Greek words in an English shape. As this argument puts it, they also mean throughout our authorized version and our whole usage, exclusively immersion or to immerse. So the Baptists contend as to their etymological and native force; but as they concede that such is not the actual use of them in English, even they, when they translate anew, give us "immersion" and "immerse."

4. If this interpretation of Luther stands, Luther was an immersionist, did teach that immersion is the synonym of Baptism, and is necessary, did hold the "Baptist doctrine of immersion;" but it is admitted that Luther did none of these, therefore this interpretation cannot stand. The argument makes Luther to be theoretically an immersionist, and only saved by hypocrisy or glaring inconsistency from being an Anabaptist in practice. A disguised Anabaptist is the Martin Luther which this new philology has given us. The positions are inconsistent with each other, and the arguments for them self-confuting.

What is the real meaning of Luther's words? It is that in its *etymological* and *primary* force (*Laut*), the German term *taufe*, like the Greek *baptismos*, the Latin *mersio*, means immersion, but he does NOT say, and there is abundant evidence that he did not believe, that in **ACTUAL USE**, either *taufe* or *baptismos* means exclusively immersion, but, on the contrary, means "washing" without reference to mode. We believe that many scholars of anti-baptist schools will concede that Luther was right in his position as to etymology, as all intelligent Baptists will, and do, concede that the etymological and primary force of any word, may be entirely different from that they have in actual use.

2. Luther, in 1519, drew the inference that it would be

right and desirable that the mode of washing should conform to the etymological and primary force, as well as to the actual use of the word. That it would be right, if the Church preferred so to do, is, we think, undisputable; that it is desirable, is, we think, very doubtful, and we can prove such was Luther's attitude to the mode when the Catechisms were written. That immersion is necessary, Luther denied in express terms, in his book on the Babylonish captivity of the same period, (1519.)

3. Luther, in 1519, under the influence of the Romish Liturgy, and of the writings of the Fathers, believed that the moral significance of Baptism, as pointing to the drowning and death of sin, though essentially unaffected by the mode, is yet brought out more clearly in immersion, and at that era *so far* preferred it. In his later Biblical Era, to which his Catechism belongs, there is ample evidence that this preference was no longer cherished.

This, then, is in brief the state of the case. The point of Luther's whole argument, in 1519, is, that inasmuch as immersion corresponds with the *etymology* of Baptism, as well as with its actual general use, which embraces every kind of washing, and as a certain signification common to all modes, is most clearly brought out in immersion, it would be right, and *so far* desirable, that *that mode*, though not necessary, but a matter of Christian freedom, should be adopted. Then, as always, he placed the mode of Baptism among the things indifferent, and would have considered it heresy to make the mode an article of faith. In the Church of Rome, some of the older rituals positively prescribe immersion; and in the ritual now set forth in that Church, by authority, there is a direction that, "Where the custom exists of baptizing by immersion, the priest shall immerse the child thrice." Luther, in his Sermon in 1519, expresses his preference for immersion, not on the ground of any superior efficacy, but because of its etymology, antiquity, and significance as a sign; and when he alludes to the fact that the children, in many places, were not so baptized, he does not express the least doubt of the validity of their Baptism.

In his book on the Babylonish Captivity, which appeared in 1520, declaring his preference again for the same mode, he expressly adds: "NOT THAT I THINK IT (immersion) NECESSARY."\* But this claim of necessity, and this only, is

\* De Captiv. Babylon. Eccles. Jena Edit., II, 273. "Non quod necessarium arbitrer."

the very heart of the Baptist doctrine. The strongest expressions in favor of immersion occur in Luther's earliest works, and his maturer preference, as expressed in later works, seem to have been no less decided for pouring as an appropriate mode.

*The Liturgies of Luther and of the Lutheran Church.*

1. The *Taufbüchlein* of Luther, 1523, is not a Lutheran Ritual, but avowedly only a translation of the Romish service, without change. He declares in the Preface to it, that there was much in it which he would have desired to remove, but which he allowed to remain, on account of the consciences of the weak, who might have imagined that he wished to introduce a new Baptism, and might regard their own Baptism as insufficient. That in this Ritual, therefore, the direction is given to dip the child, (*tauchen*,) only proves that the Romish Ritual had that Rubric.

2. But after this Translation, later in this same year, 1523, Luther issued his own directions for Baptism: *Wie man recht und Verständlich einen Menschen zum Christenglauben taufen soll.*\* This document, in the older editions of Luther's works, has been erroneously placed under 1521. The Erlangen edition, the latest and most critical ever issued, gives it its true place, under 1523. In this direction, how RIGHTLY (*recht*) and INTELLIGENTLY (*verständlich*) to baptize, Luther says: "The person baptizing POURS THE WATER, (*geusst wasser auff*,) and says, *Ego Baptizo te*," that is, in German, *Ich taüf dich*, (I baptize thee.) POURING, and pouring alone, is described as Baptism, and positively prescribed in the only Ritual of Baptism which is properly Luther's exclusive work.

3. In 1529, the year in which the Catechisms of Luther appeared, in which it is pretended that "the Baptist doctrine of immersion" is taught, he wrote the Seventeen Articles of Schwabach, or Torgau,† which became the basis of the Doctrinal Articles of the Augsburg Confession. In the Ninth Article of these, he says: We baptize WITH water, (*mit Wasser*)—and Baptism is not mere miserable water, or SPRINKLING and POURING, (*begießen*.) Here again the *begießen*, the applying of the water to the person, not the immersing of the person in water, is exclusively spoken of as the mode of Baptism.

\* Leipzig. xxii, 227. Walch x, 2,622. Erlangen xxii, 168.

† Leipzig. xx 22. Walch xvi 778. Erlangen xxiv 321.

4. In the Liturgy of Wittenberg, Luther's own home, (Consistorial Ordnung, 1542; Richter K. O. I, 369,) both dipping and pouring are placed on the same footing in every respect.

5. In the Liturgy of Halle, 1543, (II, 15,) the administrator is expressly left free to use either pouring or dipping.

6. Bugenhagen, in the conjoined work from Luther and himself, (1542,) designing to comfort mothers who had lost their children, says that Baptism of children, by pouring, was prevalent in the Lutheran Churches of Germany, (*das begießen, siehet man noch bei uns über ganz Deutschland.*)

7. In the Liturgy of the Palatinate of the Rhine, &c., 1556, of which the original edition lies before us, it says: "Whether the child shall have water poured on it once or thrice, be dipped or sprinkled, is a MATTER OF INDIFFERENCE, (*mittel massig.*) Yet, that all things may be done in the Church in good order, and to edification, we have regarded it as proper that the child should not be dipped, (*gedauht,*) but have the water poured upon it, (*begossen werden.*)" And in the Rubric: "Then shall the minister pour water (*begieße*) on the child."

8. The Liturgy of Austria, 1571, directs the Baptism to be performed by pouring or sprinkling. The later usage is so well known, that it is not necessary to multiply citations.

We shall close this part of our discussion with the words of two popular authors of the Lutheran Church in America. Dr. Schmucker, in his Popular Theology, says, very truly:

"THE QUESTION IS NOT WHETHER BAPTISM BY IMMERSION IS VALID; THIS IS NOT DOUBTED \* \* \* BUT THE QUESTION IS WHETHER IMMERSION IS ENJOINED IN SCRIPTURE, AND CONSEQUENTLY IS AN ESSENTIAL PART OF BAPTISM, SO THAT WITHOUT IT NO BAPTISM IS VALID, THOUGH IT CONTAINS EVERY OTHER REQUISITE. ON THIS SUBJECT THE LUTHERAN CHURCH HAS *always* agreed with the great majority of Christian denominations in maintaining the NEGATIVE, and in regarding the QUANTITY of water employed in Baptism as well as the mode of exhibiting it, not essential to the validity of the ordinance."

"The controversy on this subject, (the mode of applying water in Baptism) has always been regarded by the most enlightened divines, INCLUDING LUTHER, Melanchthon, and Chemnitz, as of comparatively inferior importance."

Dr. Benjamin Kurtz, in his work on Baptism, after show-

ing very conclusively that Luther was not an Immersionist, closes his discussion with these words:

"We leave our readers to judge for themselves, from the foregoing extracts, what amount of credit is due to the objection made by SOME OF OUR BAPTIST BRETHREN, that Luther believed in the necessity of submersion to THE EXCLUSION OF EFFUSION, or that he was not decidedly in favor of children's being baptized. To our more ENLIGHTENED READERS WE MAY OWE AN APOLOGY FOR MAKING OUR EXTRACTS SO COPIOUS and dwelling so long on this subject; but THE LESS INFORMED, who have been assailed again and again by this groundless objection, without ability to refute it, will know better how to appreciate our effort."

It is hardly necessary to show that these views of the mode of Baptism were held by all our old divines. A few citations will suffice:

CHEMNITZ: \* "The verb *Baptizein* does not necessarily import immersion. For it is used John 1:33, and Acts 1:5 to designate the pouring out of the Holy Spirit. And the Israelites are said, 1 Cor. 10:2, to have been baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea, who, nevertheless, were not immersed into the sea, nor dipped into the cloud. Wherefore, Paul, a most safe interpreter, says that to baptize, is the same as to purify or cleanse by the laver of water in the Word, Eph. 5:26. Whether, therefore, the water be used by merging, dipping, pouring, or sprinkling, there is a baptizing. And even the washing of hands, couches, and cups, in which water was employed, whether by merging, dipping or pouring, Mark 7:4, is called Baptism. Nor in the Baptism instituted by Christ is there needed such a rubbing of the body with water, as is needed to remove the filth of the flesh, 1 Pet. 3:21. Since, therefore our Lord has not prescribed a fixed mode of employing the water, there is no change in the substantials of Baptism, though in different Churches the water is employed in different modes."

FLACIUS ILLYRICUS: \* "*Baptizo*, by metalepsis, signifies, to wash, bathe, (*abluo, lavo*). Hence, Mark, 7:4, says: 'The Jews have various Baptisms (*i. e.*, washings) of cups and pots;' and 1 Peter, 3:21, says: 'Our Baptism is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh.' Heb. 6:2, the word Baptism refers to the purifications and washings under the old dispensation." Clavis S. S.

\* On Matt. 28:19. Exam. Concil. Trid. Ed. 1653. See, also, Harmon. Evang. C. xvi.

STEPHEN GERLACH\* says: "Herein Baptism is analogous to circumcision, which, though local, yet availed by its internal action to render the entire person acceptable to God. Thus the laver of regeneration and renewal is most efficacious, whether the person baptized be entirely merged, or dipped, or some portion only of the body be sprinkled, only so that he be baptized with water; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." On Matt. 28: 19, in Osiander.

GERHARD :\* "Baptismos and *Baptizein* are employed to designate any kind of ablution, whether it be done by sprinkling, pouring, or dipping." Loci Ed. Cotta ix, 68.

QUENSTEDT :\* "Baptism, in general, signifies washing, or ablution, whether it be done by sprinkling, pouring, dipping, or immersion."

The question of the outward mode in Baptism, is far less serious than the questions as to the internal efficacy of Baptism, its essence, its object, and results. As closely connected with the view of our Church on these points, we shall present some facts in connection with that fundamental Scriptural phrase in regard to Baptism.

"BORN OF WATER AND OF THE SPIRIT."

*The Context.*

Our Saviour says to Nicodemus, John 3: 6: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Does he refer in these words to Baptism? We think that no one ever could have doubted that there is such a reference, unless he had some preconceived theory of Baptism with which the natural meaning of these words came in conflict. The context and the text alike sustain and necessitate that interpretation which was the earliest, which was once and for ages universal, and to this hour is the general one, the interpretation which accepts these words as setting forth the Christian doctrine of Baptism. We have said the CONTEXT proves this. We will give a few illustrations which seem to us perfectly conclusive on this point:

1. Baptism, in consequence of the ministry of John the Baptist, was, at the time of the interview between our Lord and Nicodemus, the great absorbing matter of interest in the

\* On Matt. 28: 19. Exam. Concil. Trid. Ed. 1653. See, also, Harmon. Evang., C. xvi.

nation: The baptizing by John was the great religious event of the time. The subject of Baptism, in its relation to the kingdom of God, was the grand question of the hour, and there was hardly a topic on which Nicodemus would be more sure to feel an interest, and on which our Lord would be more likely to speak.

2. The fact that John baptized was regarded as evidence that he might claim to be the Christ; in other words, it was a settled part of the conviction of the nation that the Messiah would baptize, or accompany the initiation of men into his kingdom with the use of water. "The Jews sent priests and Levites to ask John, Who art thou? And he confessed and denied not; but confessed, I AM NOT THE CHRIST," John 1:20. Not a word had they uttered to imply that they supposed that he claimed to be the Christ, but his answer, to what he knew to be their thought, all the more potently proves, that it was considered that THE CHRIST WOULD BAPTIZE, that the beginning of his kingdom would be in Baptism, that he pre-eminently would be the baptizer. "They asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ?" Nicodemus came to settle in his mind, whether Jesus was the Christ. Nothing would be more sure to be a question with him than this: Whether Jesus would claim the right to baptize? The answer of John implied that he baptized by authority of the Messiah, as his divinely appointed forerunner, and provisional administrator of this right of Baptism, whose proper authority lay in Christ alone. Nicodemus would be peculiarly alive to any allusion to Baptism; would be likely to understand as referring to it any words whose obvious meaning pointed to it, and our Lord would the more carefully avoid whatever might mislead him on this point.

3. John continually characterized his work in this way: "I baptize with water," Matt. 3:2; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:26, 31, 33; Acts 1:5. At this time, and under all these circumstances, the word "water" would be connected specially with Baptism.

4. John had said of Jesus, shortly before this interview of Nicodemus, Mark 1:8: "I indeed have baptized you with water; but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Here, before the Ruler of the Jews, was the very person of whom this had been uttered; and when he takes up these words, "water" and "the spirit," it seems impossible that

Nicodemus should doubt their allusion to, and their close parallel with, John's words.

5. John had made two kinds of utterances in regard to Christ's work, and we beg the reader to note the great difference between them, for they have been confounded, and gross misrepresentation of them has been the result.

The first of these utterances we have just given, Mark 1: 8. It was made to the body of John's disciples, and the two things he makes prominent are Baptism with water, and Baptism with the Holy Ghost; that is, water and the Spirit.

The other utterance, Matt. 3: 7—12, was made to those to whom he said: "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" John knew that, as a class, the Pharisees and Sadducees who came to him were unworthy of Baptism, yet as there were exceptions, and as he could not search hearts, he baptized them all. Nevertheless, he says: "Every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the *fire*. I indeed baptize you with water, but he that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with *fire*. Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather the wheat into his garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable *fire*." When we look at these words in their connection, remember the class of persons addressed, and notice how the Baptist, in the way in which the word "*fire*" runs, fixes its meaning here, nothing seems clearer than this, that John has in view not the work of the Holy Spirit in the individual, but his great work in the mass, and not his purifying power in those who are blessed by it, but his purifying power shown in the removal and destruction of the evil. The wind created by the fan descends alike upon the wheat and the chaff; both are alike baptized by it, but with wholly different results. The purifying power of the air is shown in both. It is a single act, indeed, which renders the wheat pure by removing the impurity of the chaff. "You," says the Saviour to the generation of vipers, "shall also be baptized with the Holy Ghost." His work shall be to separate you from the wheat. You, too, shall be baptized with *fire*; the *fire* which *destroys* the impurity which has been separated by the Spirit. See also Luke 3: 9—17. The addition of the word "*fire*" marks with awful significance what is the DISTINCTION OF THE BAPTISM OF THE WICKED, AND SUCH AN IDEA, AS THAT THE CHILDREN OF GOD ARE BAPTIZED WITH

FIRE, is not to be found in the New Testament. The only thing that looks like it is Acts 2 : 3, where it is said, "There appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them," but the fire here was symbolical of the character of the TONGUES of the Apostles, of the fervor with which they glowed, and of the light which they shed, in the varied languages in which they spoke. John spoke of the Holy Spirit and fire, when he addressed those who were not to enter the kingdom of God. When he addressed true disciples, he associated water and the Spirit. When he spoke to the former, it was of the Spirit first, and then of the fire. When he speaks to the latter, it is of water first, and then of the Spirit; the one class is to be baptized with the Spirit and with fire, and are lost; the others are baptized with water and with the Spirit, and will enter the kingdom of God. When John contrasted his Baptism with that of the Saviour, he meant not this: I baptize with water only, without the Spirit, and he will baptize with the Spirit only, and not with water; he meant: I baptize with water; that is all I can do in my own person, but he who in his divine power works with me now, and baptizes with the provisional measure of the Holy Spirit, will yet come in his personal ministry, and then he will attend the Baptism of water, with the full gospel measure of the Spirit. When, our Lord, therefore, taking up as it were and opening still further the thought of John, adopts his two terms in the same connection in which he had placed them, he meant that Nicodemus should understand by "water" and the "Spirit" the outward part of Baptism, and that Divine Agent, who in it, with it, and under it, offers his regenerating grace to the soul of man.

6. It is not to be forgotten that Nicodemus was asking for a fuller statement of the doctrine of the new birth. He asked: "How can a man be born when he is old?" The emphasis is not on the word "CAN" alone, as if he meant to express a doubt of the truth of our Saviour's proposition; the emphasis rests also on the word "HOW." He meant to say: A man cannot be born again in the natural sense and ordinary way. How then, in what sense, and by what means, CAN he be born again? It is impossible that one interested in grace itself should not be alive to its means. For our Saviour not to have made an allusion to any of the divine modes as well as to the Divine Agent of the change, would seem to make the reply a very imperfect one. But if any one of the means of grace is alluded to, the allusion is

certainly in the word "water;" and admitting this, the inference will hardly be resisted that "Baptism" is meant.

7. The entire chapter, after the discourse with Nicodemus, is occupied with *baptisms, baptismal questions, and baptismal discourses.*

a. In verse 23, the word "water" occurs: "John was baptizing in *Ænon*, because there was much *water* there.

b. It is not unworthy of notice, that immediately following the conversation of our blessed Lord with Nicodemus, come these words "*After these things came Jesus and his disciples unto the land of Judea, and there he tarried with them and baptized.*"

c. John's disciples and the Jews came to him and said: "Rabbi, he to whom thou bearest witness, *behold the same baptizeth*, and all men come to him." Then John replies: "Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, *I am not the Christ*, but that I am sent before him." The authority for John's Baptism was secondary, derived from Christ. Christ now takes it into his own hands, and prepares to endow it with the fulness of the gifts of his Spirit.

#### *The Text.*

The context of these words demonstrate that by "water" our Saviour meant Baptism. The evidence of the text itself, is equally decisive that this is his meaning. It is conceded by all, that if the word "water" be taken literally, it means "Baptism;" hence, all those who deny that it refers to Baptism understand it figuratively, and in that fact acknowledge that to prove that it is to be taken literally, is to prove that it refers to Baptism.

We remark, then,

1. That to take the word "water," figuratively, makes an incongruity with the idea of a birth. It is said that water here is the figure of the cleansing and purifying power of the Holy Spirit. But there is an incongruity in such an interpretation. Had the Saviour meant this, he would naturally have said: Except a man be *cleansed*, or *washed* with water, not "born of" it.

2. One of the figurative interpretations is in conflict with the evident meaning of the word "Spirit" here. For it is clear from the whole connection, that the Spirit here means the Holy Spirit as a person. In the next verse it is said: "That which is born of the *SPIRIT* is Spirit," and in the 8th verse: "So is every one that is born of the *SPIRIT*." No

sound interpreter of any school, so far as we know, disputes that the word "Spirit," in these passages, means the Holy Spirit as a person; and nothing is more obvious than that the word in the 5th verse means just what it does in the following ones. But if "water" is figurative, then the phrase water and Spirit, means, in one of the figurative interpretations, "spiritual water;" that is, the substantive Spirit is used as an adjective, and not as the name of a person. This false interpretation makes the phrase mean "spiritual water," and Baptism and the Holy Spirit both vanish before it. In its anxiety to read Baptism out of the text, it has read the Holy Spirit out of it, too.

3. Another figurative interpretation turns the words the other way, as if our Saviour had said: "Born of the Spirit and water," and now it means not that we are to be born again of "spiritual water," but that we are to be born again of the "aqueous or water-like Spirit." But not only does such a meaning seem poor and ambiguous, but it supposes the one term, "Spirit," to be literal, and the other "water," to be figurative; but as they are governed by the same verb and preposition, this would seem incredible, even apart from the other cogent reasons against it. In common life, a phrase in which such a combination was made, would be regarded as absurd.

4. The term "to be born of" leads us necessarily to the same result.

a. The phrase is employed in speaking of natural birth, as in Matt. 1:16: "Mary of whom *was born* Jesus."

Luke 1:35: "That holy thing which shall *be born* of thee, shall be called the Son of God." So in this chapter, "that which is *born* of the flesh."

b. It is employed to designate spiritual birth. Thus John 1:13: ("the sons of God) *were born* not of the blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Here no symbolical title is used, but the literal name of the Author of the new birth. So in this chapter, v. 8: "So is every one that is *born* of the Spirit." John, in his gospel and epistles, uses the phrase "to be born of" fifteen times. In fourteen of them, it is not pretended that any of the terms used to designate the cause of the birth is symbolical. The fifteenth instance is the one before us.

The phrase to "be born of" is never connected elsewhere in the New Testament with terms indicative of the means or cause of birth, which are symbolical in their character. The

whole New Testament usage is in conflict with the supposition, that it is here linked with a symbolical term.

"Born of God" is used some eight or nine times. "Born of the Spirit" is used twice, and these, with the words before us, exhaust the New Testament use of the phrase.

Without the context, then, the text itself would settle the question, and demonstrate that our Lord referred to Baptism.

#### *The Parallels.*

The words of our Lord Jesus to Nicodemus are the keynote to the whole body of New Testament representation in regard to the necessity and efficacy of Baptism. The view which regards the words "Born of water and of the Spirit" as referring to Baptism, is sustained and necessitated by the whole body of PARALLELS in the gospels and epistles. Let us look at a few of these:

1. In Titus 3 : 5, Paul, speaking of God our Saviour, says: "He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

Here the subject is the same as in John 3 : 5, the new birth, or regeneration. There is a parallel between "born of God," and "regeneration," and "renewing;" between "water" and "washing," or laver. "The Spirit" in the one is parallel with "the Holy Ghost" in the other, and "Entering into the kingdom of heaven" in the one has its parallel in the other, in the words, "He saved us." What a beautiful comment does Paul make on our Lord's work. Take up the words in John and ask Paul their meaning. What is it to be "born again?" Paul replies, "It is to experience regeneration and renewing." What is the "water," of which our Lord says we must be born? It is the washing of regeneration. What is the Spirit? Paul replies, "The Holy Spirit." What is it to enter the kingdom of God? It is to be saved.

2. So in Ephes. 5 : 26: "Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word."

In these words the new birth is represented as sanctifying and cleansing; the "water" is expressly mentioned; to be "born of water" is explained as a "sanctifying and cleansing with the washing of water," and the "Word" as a great essential of Baptism and organ of the Holy Spirit in it, is introduced.

3. Hebrews 10 : 21: "Let us draw near with a true heart, in

full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

Here Baptism is regarded as essential to having a true heart and full assurance of faith, and the mode in which "water" is used is defined in the words, "having our bodies washed with pure water."

4. In 1 John 5:6—8, speaking of Jesus: "This is he that came by *water* and blood, not by *water* only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. And there are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood."

Here is a most decisive confutation by John himself of the glosses put upon his Master's words. They demonstrate that "water" and "Spirit" are not one. "There are *three* that bear witness, the Spirit, *and* the water, and the blood."

5. The parallel in St. Peter, is also very important. 1 Pet. 3:21—22: "The Ark, wherein few, that is, eight, souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto *even* Baptism doth now save us."

The water lifted the Ark above it, away from the death which overwhelmed the world. It separated the eight souls from the lost, and saved them while it destroyed the others. Here the Apostle, speaking of "souls saved by water," declares that Baptism, in such sense, corresponded with the deluge, that we say of it also, "It saves *us*,"—the implication being irresistible—that the whole thought involved is this: in the Church, as in the Ark, souls are saved by water, that is, by Baptism. Having said so great a thing of Baptism, the Apostle adds: "Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." That is, it is not as a mere outward purifier, or ceremonial washing, Baptism operates. Its gracious effects are conditioned on the state of heart of him to whom they are offered. He who in faith accepts Baptism in its purifying energy through the Spirit of God, also receives it in its saving result.

6. The words of our Lord Jesus, elsewhere, fully sustain the view which the Church takes of his meaning in John 3:5. In his final commission he charges the Apostles "to *baptize*" the nations, Matt. 28:19, and connects with it the promise: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved;" and adds: "but he that believeth not shall be damned," Mark 16:16.

Reader, ponder, we beseech you, these words. Do not

separate what God hath joined together. Who shall be saved? First, He only that *believeth*. That is decisive against the idea that Sacraments operate apart from the spiritual state of the recipient. It is a death-blow to formalism—a death-blow to Rome, and to Oxford. We are justified by faith; that is written with a sunbeam in the words: “He that believeth \* \* shall be saved.” But is that all the Saviour said? No! he adds, “AND IS BAPTIZED, shall be saved.” Who dares read a “NOT” in the words, and make our Saviour say, “He that believeth, and is NOT baptized, shall be saved?” But the man who says “Baptism *is in no sense* necessary to salvation,” does contradict the words of our Lord. But if it be granted that *in any sense* our Lord teaches that Baptism is necessary to salvation, then it makes it highly probable that the same doctrine is asserted in John 3:5. The reader will please notice that we are not now attempting to settle the precise meaning of either the words in John or the parallels. Our question now simply is, What is the *subject* when our Saviour speaks of water and the Spirit?

7. In the minds of the Apostles the doctrines of our Lord, of the necessity *in some sense*, (we are not inquiring now, in *what* sense or with what limitations) of Baptism, to salvation was ever present. When the multitudes said to Peter, and to the rest of the Apostles, “Men and brethren, what shall we do?” then Peter said unto them, “Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Now, mark—first, that Baptism and the Holy Spirit are separately spoken of, as in John 3:5; second, that Baptism is represented as a means or condition of receiving the gift of the Holy Ghost; third, that besides repentance, Baptism is enjoined as necessary; fourth, that it is clearly set forth as in *some sense* essential to the remission of sins.

8. The Apostles and other ministers of the Lord Jesus baptized all persons: “When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, they were baptized,” Acts 8:12. When Philip preached Jesus to the eunuch, he said, “What doth hinder me to be baptized?” And Philip said, “If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest;” not, as some would say now, “If thou believest with all thine heart, there is no need of being baptized.” Thus, Lydia and her household; the Jailer and his household.

No matter where or when the Spirit of God wrought his

work in men, they were baptized, as if for some reason, and in some sense it was felt that this was necessary to an entrance on the kingdom of God.

9. Ananias said to Saul, after announcing to him the commission which God gave him: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," Acts 22: 16.

Here Baptism is represented as necessary, in *some sense*, even to a converted man, as a means, *in some sense*, of washing away sins.

10. As resonances of the wonderful words of our Lord, we have the Apostle's declaration: "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death, therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death. By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."

Thus comparing God's Word with itself do we reach a sure ground. Context, text, and parallel, the great sources of a sound interpretation of the living oracles, all point to one result, in determining what our Lord spoke of when he said: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

#### *The Resorts of Interpreters.*

The form of speech to which resource has most frequently been had here to get a figure out of the words, is that which is called "HENDIADYS;" that is, the phrase in which *one* (Hen) is presented by (dia) *two*, (dys.) That is to say, *two* nouns are used where one would answer, by presenting the idea of the other in an adjective form. Thus Virgil says: "We offered drinks in bowls and gold;" that is, in golden bowls, or bowl-shaped gold. By this hendiadys, the Saviour is said here to have meant "spiritual water," or "the water-like Spirit."

Now let us look at this "hendiadys" by which it is proposed to set aside the natural meaning of our Saviour's words. We remark:

1. That, after a careful search, we cannot find a solitary instance (leaving this out of question for a moment) in which it is supposed that the Saviour used the form of speech known as hendiadys. It was not characteristic of him.

2. Neither was it of John the Evangelist, whose style is closely formed upon that class of our Lord's discourses which he records in his gospel.

3. Nor is it characteristic of the style of any of the New Testament writers. But three instances of it are cited in the entire New Testament by Glass in his *Sacred Philology*, and in every one of those three, the language is more easily interpreted without the hendiadys than with it. Winer, the highest authority on such a point, says, in regard to hendiadys in the New Testament: "The list of examples alleged, does not, when strictly examined, furnish one that is unquestionable."<sup>\*</sup>

4. The passage in Matt. 3:11: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," is the only one in which it is pretended that a parallel is found with the one before us; but we have shown in a former part of this article, that there is no hendiadys there; the fire and the Holy Ghost are distinct subjects. The persons addressed were neither to be baptized exclusively with the Holy-Spirit-like fire, or the fire-like Holy Spirit, but just as our Lord says, with both; with the Holy Spirit and with fire, the former in his personality separating them as the breath of the purifier's fan, and the latter consuming them as the purifier's flame.

5. But we have a little more to say in regard to this hendiadys; and that is, that if we even concede that it is used here, it does not help the figurative interpretation at all. For look at its real character a moment. Hendiadys does not affect at all the question of the *literalness* or figurativeness of the terms embraced in it; it does not change their *meaning*, but simply their form. Take, for example, the illustration we gave from Virgil: "bowls" and "gold" are both literal; and to have "golden bowls," you must have literal gold as well as literal bowls; not gold analogous to a bowl, or a bowl like to gold. So Lucan says of a horse: "He champed the brass and bit;" that is, the brass-formed bit; but the brass was real, and the bit was real; it does not mean the brass-like bit, or the bit-like brass. So, in Acts 14:13, it is said that the expression "oxen and garlands," is a hendiadys, and means "garlanded oxen." We are not quite sure that it does; but if it does, it means there were literally garlands and literally oxen. Oxen is not figurative, meaning strength, of which the ox is a symbol; nor does "garlands" mean "honored," though garlands are an

\* Gramm. of N. T. Diction. Transl. by Masson. Smith, English & Co. 1859, p. 652.

image of honor. It does not mean that they brought honored strength, or strong honor, to the gates; but hendiadys or no hendiadys, it involves equally that there were oxen and garlands. So here, even supposing a hendiadys, we must none the less have literally water, and literally the Spirit.

The only thing hendiadys proves, is, that the things it involves are not separated; and if we suppose a hendiadys here, it leaves both the water and the Spirit as literal terms, and only involves this, that they are conjoined in the one birth. In other words, hendiadys only makes a slight bend in the route, and brings us after all to the same result as the most direct and artless interpretation, to wit, that our Saviour referred to Baptism in his words to Nicodemus.

Another resort, more extreme than the one we have just disposed of, is that of the EPEXEGESIS, that is to suppose that the "AND" gives the words this force: "Born of water, THAT IS TO SAY, of the Spirit." It is contended that it is parallel to such an expression as this: "God and our Father," which means: "God, *that is to say*, our Father." In the Epexegesis, one thing is spoken of in more than one aspect, and, hence, under more than one term. For instance, in the phrase we have quoted: "God and our Father" means: That Being who is God, *as to his nature*, and Father, *as to his relation to us*, God essentially, and Father relatively; in a word, *both* God and Father. It does not make the term God metaphorical, and the term Father the literal substitute for it. If an epexegesis, therefore, were supposable in John 3:5, the phrase could only mean: Born of that which is water, as to its outer part, and Spirit, as to its internal agent, that is, *both* water and Spirit. It is, therefore, of no avail to resort to the epexegesis here, even if it were allowable. But it is not allowable. There is not an instance, so far as we know, in human language, in which a noun used metaphorically is conjoined by a simple "and" with a term which is literal and is meant to explain it. In a word, the tricks of a false interpretation, which are sometimes very specious, utterly fail in this case. Our Lord has fixed the sense of his words so surely, that the unprejudiced who weigh them calmly, cannot be at a loss as to their meaning.

#### THE DOCTRINES OF ORIGINAL SIN AND OF BAPTISM, IN THEIR RELATIONS TO EACH OTHER.

The doctrine of our Church on these points, will be found summarily stated in the Second Article of the Augsburg

Confession. It is placed in its historical relation between the first Article which treats of God, in his essence and in his creative and providential work, and the third, which is of the Son of God, the Redeemer. Between these naturally comes the doctrine of sin, and especially of sin in its original spring, both in the first man and in each individual of his posterity.

*Analysis of the Article.*

The Article of the Confession, if analyzed, will be found to present, either in so many words, or by just inference, the following points:

1. The doctrine of original sin is taught with *great unanimity* by our Churches.
2. The *time* of the operation of original sin is the whole time subsequent to the fall of Adam.
3. The *persons affected* by it are all human beings born in the course of nature.
4. The *mode of the perpetuation* of original sin, is that of the natural extension of our race.
5. The *great fact asserted* in this doctrine, is this, that all human beings are conceived and born in, and with sin.
6. This sin *results or reveals its working* in these respects.
  - a. That all human beings are born without the fear of God.
  - b. They are born without trust toward God.
  - c. That they are born with concupiscence, that is, that from their birth they are full of evil desire and evil propensity.
  - d. That they can have, by nature, no true fear nor love of God, nor faith in God.
7. The *essence* of original sin involves, that this disease or vice of origin is *truly sin*.
8. The *natural consequence* of this original sin, is this: that it condemns and brings now, also, eternal death.
9. This natural consequence is *actually incurred* by all who are not *born again*.
10. When the new birth takes place it is invariably wrought by the *Holy Spirit*.
11. This new birth by the Holy Spirit, has Baptism as an *ordinary means*.
12. Baptism is the *only ordinary means* of *universal application*.
13. Our Church condemns, first, The Pelagians, and, sec-

ondly, all others who deny that the vice of origin is sin, and thirdly, all who contend that man by his own strength, as a rational being, can be justified before God; fourthly, and who thus diminish the glory of the merit of Christ and of his benefits.

It is with the Eleventh of these theses, alone, that we desire for the present to occupy the attention of the reader.

*Relations of Baptism to Original Sin. The Eleventh Thesis.*

11. This new birth, by the Holy Spirit, has Baptism as one of its ordinary means.

The part of the Second Article of the Augsburg Confession which comes under discussion in this thesis is that which asserts that original sin brings eternal death to all those who are not born again of *Baptism* and of the Holy Spirit. We have shown the absolute necessity of being born again: we have seen that the Holy Spirit is absolutely essential to that new birth: it now remains to explain and vindicate our Confession in its declaration that the new birth must also be of *Baptism*.

As this is one of the points specially objected to, and as these words have been omitted in the Definite Platform, which, so far as its omission is evidence, denies not only the necessity of *Baptism*, but the necessity altogether either of the *new birth* or of the *Holy Spirit* to remove the results of original sin, we may be pardoned for dwelling at some length upon it. The doctrine of our Church, in regard to *Baptism*, is one of the few fundamental points, on which any part of evangelical Christendom avowedly differs from her. We propose to give first some historical matter bearing upon the origin and meaning of these words in our Confession. We shall present these chronologically.

*I. The Marburg Articles.*

1529. The fifteen doctrinal articles of Luther, prepared at the Colloquy at Marburg, October 3rd, may be regarded as the remoter basis of the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession. The fourth, fifth, and sixth of these articles, exhibit in full the relations of original sin and salvation. They run thus: "In the *fourth* place we believe that original sin is inborn in us, and inherited by us from Adam, and is a sin of such kind that it condemns all men, and if Jesus Christ had not come to our help with his life and death, we

must have died eternally therein, and could not have come to the kingdom and blessedness of God. In the *fifth* place we believe that we are redeemed from this sin and from all other sins, and from eternal death, if we believe on the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who died for us, and without this faith we cannot be absolved from a single sin by any work, condition, or Order. In the *sixth* place, that this faith is a gift of God, which we can gain by no antecedent work or merit, nor can reach by any power of our own, but the Holy Ghost gives and furnishes it where he will, in our hearts, when we hear the gospel or word of Christ. In the *seventh* place, this faith is our righteousness before God.”\*

## II. *The Seventeen Doctrinal Articles.*

1530. These Marburg Articles, which were signed by LU-  
THER, MELANCHTHON, ZWINGLE and ECOLAMPADIUS, and the other leading theologians on both sides, were laid by Lu-  
ther as the ground-work of the Seventeen Doctrinal Articles, which were prepared the same year, and which appeared in 1530. These Seventeen Articles are the direct basis of the doctrinal portion of the Augsburg Confession, of which Lu-  
ther, with far more propriety than Melanchthon, can be styled the author. Melanchthon was the *composer* of the Augsburg Confession rather than its *author*. In the fourth of these Articles, Luther says: “Original sin would condemn all men who come from Adam, and would separate them forever from God, had not Jesus Christ become our representative, and taken upon himself this sin and all sins which follow upon it, and by his sufferings made satisfaction therefor, and thus utterly removed and annulled them in himself, as is clearly taught in regard to this sin in Psalm fifty-first and Romans fifth.”†

## III. *The German Edition of 1533.*

1533. In Melanchthon’s German Edition of the Confession, in 1533, the only edition in the German in which any variations were made by him, and which has never been charged with deviating in meaning in any respect from the original Confession, this part of the Article runs thus: “(Original sin) condemns all those under God’s wrath, who

\* The Articles are given in full in Rudelbach’s *Reformation*, Luther-thum u. Union, p. 665.

† Jena Ed. v. 14. Mentzer, *Exeges. Aug. Conf.*, p. 42.

are not born again through *Baptism* and faith in *Christ*, through the *gospel* and *Holy Spirit..\**"

#### IV. *Meaning of the Confession.*

From these historical parallels and illustrations, certain facts are very clear as to the meaning of the Confession.

##### *Drift of the Article.*

1. The article teaches us what original sin would do if there were no redemption provided in Christ. The mere fact that Christ has wrought out his work, provides a sufficient remedy, *if it be applied, to save every human creature from the effects of original sin.* Let not this great fact be forgotten. Let it never be left out of the account in looking at the mystery of original sin, that there is an ample arrangement by which the redemption of every human creature from the results of original sin could be effected, that there is no lack in God's *provision* for saving every one of our race from its results. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for *every man.*"

##### *Is any Man Lost for Original Sin only?*

2. It is not the doctrine of our Confession that any human creature has ever been, or ever will be, lost purely on account of original sin. For while it supposes that original sin, if *unarrested*, would bring death, it supposes it to be arrested, certainly and ordinarily, by the Holy Spirit, through the divine means rightly received, and throws no obstacle in the way of our hearty faith, that in the case of infants dying without the means, the Holy Spirit, in his own blessed way, directly and extraordinarily, may make the change that delivers the child from the power of indwelling sin.

Luther in his marginal note on John 15 : 22, says: "Through Christ original sin is annulled, and NO MAN, since Christ's coming, is condemned, unless he will not forsake it, (original sin,) that is, will not believe."

##### *Who are Mainly Referred to in this Article?*

3. It seems very probable, from the parallels, that the Confessors had mainly, though not exclusively, in their eye in this particular part of the article, original sin as developing itself in *actual sin in the adult*, and requiring the work

\* Weber's Edit. Weimar, 1781.

of the Holy Spirit to save men from its curse. Hence the illustrious Pfaff, in his brief, but very valuable, notes on the Confession, says: "The language here has chiefly (*maxime*) reference to adults who despise Baptism," and such is unquestionably the drift of the form in which Melanchthon puts it in the edition of 1533.

*Baptism: In what sense Necessary.*

4. The Confession does not teach that the outward part of *Baptism* regenerates those who receive it. It says, that it is necessary to be born again of Baptism and of the *Holy Spirit*. It is evident from this, that it draws a distinction between the two. It implies that we may have the *outward* act of Baptism performed, and not be born again; but confessedly we cannot have the saving energy of the *Holy Ghost* exercised upon us, without being born again, whether ordinarily, in Baptism, or, extraordinarily, without Baptism. Hence, while the doctrine of the Confession is that the new birth *itself* is *absolutely* essential to salvation, and that the energy of the *Holy Spirit* is *absolutely* essential to the new birth, it is not its doctrine that the *outward part* of Baptism is *absolutely* essential, nor that *regeneration* necessarily attends it. The *necessity* of the *outward part* of Baptism is not the absolute one of the *Holy Spirit*, who himself *works* regeneration, but the *ordinary* necessity of the precept, and of the means. God has enjoined it, has connected his promise with it, and makes it one of the ordinary channels of his grace.

*Is Baptism Absolutely Necessary?*

5. Hence, of necessity, goes to the ground the assumption that the Augsburg Confession teaches that unbaptized infants are lost, or that any man deprived, without any fault of his own, of Baptism is lost. The *absolute* necessity of Baptism has been continually denied in our Church. Luther, as is well known to all readers of his works, denied the absolute necessity of Baptism, as did the other great Reformers of our Church.

CARPZOV, whose Introduction to our Symbolical Books is a classic, says: "The Augsburg Confession does not say, that unbaptized infants may not be regenerated in an *extraordinary* mode. The harsh opinion of Augustine and of other fathers in regard to this, was based upon a misunderstanding of John 3:5, for they regarded those words as

teaching an *absolute* necessity of Baptism, when in fact that necessity is only *ordinary*, a necessity, which binds us and will not allow us to despise or neglect Baptism, but does not at all bind God to this means, as if he *could* not, or *would* not, in a case of necessity arising in his own providence, perform that in an *extraordinary* way, which in other cases he performs in an *ordinary* one, through means instituted by himself. As, therefore, the texts of Scripture speak of an *ordinary* necessity; so, also, of that same sort of necessity, and of no other, do the Protestants speak in the Augsburg Confession."

It would be very easy to cite evidence on the same point from all our most eminent Lutheran writers on the doctrine of our Church, but it is not necessary here. No one who has read them will need any citations to establish a fact, with which he is so familiar; and yet there are men who tell the world that it is a doctrine of our Church that Baptism is so absolutely essential, that all unbaptized persons are necessarily lost. Such statements involve a lack of ordinary morality on the part of those who make them; for if they are so ignorant as not to know that they are uttering untruths, their pretending to speak of them, as if they knew something about them, shows a complete want of truthfulness.

#### *Infant Salvation in the Lutheran System.*

6. The truth is, no system so thoroughly as that of our Church, places the salvation of infants on the very highest ground.

"The *Pelagian* system would save them on the ground of personal innocence, but that ground we had seen to be fallacious." The *Calvinistic* system places their salvation on the ground of divine election, and speaks of *elect* infant, and, hence, in its older and more severely logical shape, at least, supposed not only that some unbaptized, but also that some baptized infants, were lost. The *Baptist* system, which totally withholds Baptism from the infant, and every system which, while it confers the outward rite, denies that there is a grace of the Holy Spirit, of which Baptism is the ordinary channel, are alike destitute of their theory of any *means* actually appointed of God to heal the soul of the infant. The *Romish* system, too Pelagian to think that original sin could bring the pains of death, and too tenacious of the external rite, to concede that an infant can be saved without it, teaches the idle theory, that the unbaptized infant is neither

positively lost, in the fullest sense, nor is it saved. It is neither in heaven nor hell, but in a dreary *limbo*. How beautiful and self-harmonious over against all these, is the view of our Church. It knows of no non-elect infants, but believes that our children are alike in the eyes of Infinite Mercy. It confesses that all children are sinners by nature, and believes that the Holy Spirit must change those natures. It believes that God has appointed Baptism as the ordinary channel through which the Holy Spirit makes that change in the nature of a child. In the fact that there is an ordinary means appointed, our Church sees the guarantee that God wishes to renew and save children, and *what so powerfully as this*, prompts the blessed *assurance*, that if God fails to reach the child in his ordinary way, he will reach it in some other. The Calvinist *might* have doubts as to the salvation of a dying child, for to him Baptism is not a sure guarantee, and its grace is meant only for the elect; the Baptist *ought* to have doubt on his system, as to whether an infant can be saved, for his system supposes that God has no appointed means for conferring grace on it, and the presumption is almost irresistible, that where God has no *means* to do a thing, he does not intend to do it; but the Lutheran cannot doubt on this point of such tender and vital interest. The baptized child, he feels assured, is actually accepted of the Saviour, and under the benignant power of the Holy Ghost. Infant Baptism is the gracious pledge that God means to save little children; that they have a distinct place in his plan of mercy, and that he has a distinct mode of putting them in that place. When, then, in the mysterious providence of this Lover of these precious little ones, they are cut off from the reception of his grace, by its ordinary channel, our Church still cherishes the most blessed assurance, in the very existence of infant Baptism, that in some *other way* God's wisdom and tenderness will reach and redeem them. Our confidence in the uncovenanted mercy of God is strong just in proportion to the tenacity with which we cling to Baptism as an ordinary means, most necessary on our part, if we may possibly have it, or have it given. Because in the green valley and along the still waters of the *visible* Church, God has made rich provision for these poor sin-stricken lambs; because he has a *fold* into which he gathers them out of the bleak world, therefore, do we believe that if one of them faint ere the earthly hands, which act for Christ,

can bring it to the fold and pasture, the great Shepherd, in his own blessed person, will bear to it the food and the water necessary to nurture its undying life, and will take it into the fold on high, for which the earthly fold is meant, at best, but a safeguard for a little while. But the earthly fold itself, reared in the valley of peace which lies along the water which ripples with something of a heavenly music, is a sure token of a love which will never fail of its object, a visible pledge that it is not the will of our Father in heaven that *one* of these little ones should perish. Although these facts may be considered decisive, yet it may not be useless further to look into the question,

#### IS BAPTISM NECESSARY TO SALVATION?

The Augsburg Confession (Art. IX, 1,) declares that Baptism is necessary to salvation." Is it justified in so doing? Can we accept a statement apparently so sweeping? Is it a Scripture statement?

In order properly to answer these questions, it is necessary to determine what the Confessors meant. In all human writings, and in the Book of God, occur propositions apparently universal, which are, nevertheless, in the mind of the writer, limited in various ways. What is the meaning of the proposition of our Confession? Is it absolute, and without exceptions, and if it meant to allow exceptions, what are they? The first question we naturally ask, in settling the meaning of our Confession, is,

#### I. *What is Baptism.*

The Platform, in defining *what* Baptism it supposes the Church to connect with salvation, designates it as "such WATER BAPTISM."

But what our Church affirms of the blessings of Baptism, she does not affirm of "water Baptism," that is, of the application of water *per se*.

The total efficacy of the sacraments is defined in the Augsburg Confession, (Art. V, 2,) thus, that through them and the word, "as instruments, or means, God gives his Holy Spirit who worketh faith." It would at once remove much of the grossest prejudice against the doctrine of our Church, if it were known and remembered that the Baptism, of whose blessings she makes her affirmative, embraces not merely the external element, but yet more, and pre-eminently, the word and the Holy Spirit. She regards it as just as absurd to

refer any blessings to Baptism, as *her enemies define* it, as it would be to attribute to swords and guns, the power of fighting battles without soldiers to wield them.

Her first lesson on the subject is: "Baptism is not mere water," (Cat. Min., 361, 2.) "Wherefore," says Luther, (Cat. Maj., 487, 15,) "it is pure knavery and Satanic scoffing, that now-a-days these new spirits, in order to revile Baptism, separate from it the word and institution of God, and look upon it as if it were mere water from the well, and then, with their childish driveling, ask, 'What good can a handful of water do the soul?' Yes, good friend, who does not know that when you separate the parts of Baptism, water is water?" "Baptism cannot be sole and simple water, (do. 26) mere water cannot have that power." Not by virtue of the water," (do. 29.) "Not that the water (of Baptism) is in itself better than any other water," (do. 14.) So in the Smaleald Articles: "We do not hold with Thomas and the Dominican friars, who, forgetful of the word and the institution of God, say, That God has conferred a spiritual power on water, which washes away sin through the water," (320, 2.)

"Baptism," says Gerhard,\* "is the washing of water in the word, in which washing the whole adorable Trinity purifieth from sin him who is baptized, *not by the work wrought (ex opere operato) but by the effectual working of the Holy Ghost coming upon him, and by his own faith.*" Such is the tenor of all the definitions our Church gives of Baptism, from the simple elementary statements of the Catechism up to the elaborate definitions of the great doctrinal systems.

The assumption, then, that what the Church says of Baptism, she affirms of mere water Baptism, rests on a fundamental misapprehension. Whatever is wrought is Baptism, is wrought by the Holy Ghost, through the word, with the water, in the believing soul.

### III. *Baptism is not always followed by Regeneration. Regeneration not always preceded by Baptism.*

"That some adults, by actual impenitence, hypocrisy, and obstinacy, deprive themselves of the salutary efficacy of Baptism, we freely admit." Gerhard (IX, 170.)

Just as clear as they are in their judgment that Baptism is not necessarily followed by regeneration, are our Church,

\* Loci (Cotta) ix, 318.

and her great divines, in the judgment that Baptism is not necessarily preceded by Baptism, or attended by it.

The Augsburg Confession (Art. V) declares the gospel (as well as the Sacraments) to be the means whereby the Holy Ghost works and confers faith, and (Art. VII) presents the gospel purely preached (as well as the sacraments) as that whereby the true Church is marked out and made.

"As we come alone through the word of God, to God, and are justified, and no man can embrace the word but by faith, it follows that by faith we are justified." Apol. 99, 68.

"The natural man is, and remains, an enemy of God, until, by the power of the Holy Ghost, through the word preached and heard, he is converted, endowed with faith, *re-generated* and renewed." Form. Concord, 589, 5.

"We cannot obey the law unless we are *born again* through the gospel." Apol. Conf. 140, 190. "Faith alone brings us to a new birth." Do. 119, 61. "This faith alone justifies and regenerates." Do. 138, 171. "Regeneration is wrought by faith in repentance." Do. 253.

"When, therefore," says Gerhard (Loc. VIII, 325) "they are baptized, who have already been regenerated through the word, as a spiritual seed, they have no need of regeneration through Baptism, but in them Baptism is a confirmation and sealing of regeneration."

*Men may be Unbaptized and be Saved.*

When Nicodemus asked, "How can a man be born when he is old?" Jesus replied, "Of water and of the Spirit," and extends the proposition to all "that which is born of the flesh;" that is, to "all men after the fall of Adam, who are born in the course of nature," (A. C., Art. II.) The necessity of the new birth he clearly predicates upon the fact, that the flesh, which is such by virtue of fleshly birth, requires this change.

We need not stop here to show that in John 3 : 5, water means Baptism. The Platform concedes this (p. 31): "The language of the Saviour, *doubtless*, refers also to *Baptism*."

But even critics who deny this, concede that in John 3 : 6, man is contemplated as the subject of original sin. Those who concede this, (and this all concede,) and who concede that "water" means Baptism, (and this the Platform concedes,) concede that, not only in the phraseology, but in the connection, application and argument of that phraseology, the Augsburg Confession is perfectly justified by the Saviour's

language, when it says (Art. II,) "this original sin" ("that which is born of the flesh is flesh") "brings now also eternal death" ("cannot see the kingdom of God") "to those who are not born again of Baptism ('water') and of the Holy Ghost." If the case is made out from these words, against the Confession of the Church, it is also made out against the Saviour, to whose words it so closely adheres. The dilemma, then, is irresistible, either that both teach it, or that neither does. As regards the effectual overthrow of their own position, it matters little which horn the objectors take. If they take the one, then, on their own concession, the Saviour teaches Baptismal regeneration; if they take the other, on their own concession the Confession does not teach Baptismal regeneration. Is, then, the inference warranted, that our Saviour in his words, and our Confession in its use of them, mean to affirm an absolute and unconditional necessity, that a man shall be born of water, before he can enter into the kingdom of God? We reply, that neither the Saviour nor the Confession meant to affirm this, but simply an *ordinary* necessity. "The necessity of Baptism is not *absolute*, but *ordinary*." Gerhard (IX, 383.) Bellarmine had argued from John 3:5, for the Romish doctrine that unbaptized infants are lost. Gerhard (IX, 287,) replied: "1. The warning of Christ bears not upon the privation of the Sacrament, but the contempt of it. 2. He describes the ordinary rule, from which cases of necessity are expected. We are bound to the use of the means, but God may show his grace in extraordinary ways."

#### IV. *Are Unbaptized Infants Saved?*

How touchingly and consolingly LUTHER wrote upon this topic, is known to all admirers of his writings. Bugenhagen, in an admirable Treatise, which is incorporated in Luther's Works, and was issued with a Preface by him, shows at large, that neither to infants nor adults is the necessity of baptism absolute. "Rather should we believe that the prayers of pious parents, or of the Church are graciously heard, and that these children are received by God into his favor and eternal life." Gerhard, IX, 284.

On the whole dark question of the relation of the heathen world to salvation, the early writers of our Church generally observe a wise caution. Yet even in the school of the most rigid orthodoxy we find the breathings of tender hope. "It is false," says Mentzer, (Oper. I. 959, quoted in Gerhard—

Cotta,) "that original sin in infants out of the Church is an adequate cause of reprobation; for men are never said in Scripture to be reprobated on that account solely. But as faith alone justifies and saves, so also, as Luther says, unbelief alone condemns."

Ægidius Hunnius, whom Gerhard pronounced the most admirable of the theologians of his period, and of whom another great writer says, that by universal consent he holds the third place of merit after Luther, says (*In Quaest. in Cap. VII. Gen.* :) "I would not dare to affirm that the little children of heathen, without distinction, are lost for God desireth not the death of any—Christ died for them also," &c. (Quoted in Gerhard IX. 284.)

Our Church, then, does not teach that Baptism "is necessarily and unavoidably attended by spiritual regeneration," but holds that a man may be baptized, and remain then and forever in the gall of bitterness, and in the bonds of iniquity, and therefore holds as heartily and fully as the Platform, (p. 29) "that baptism in adults does not necessarily effect or secure their regeneration."

#### V. *Baptism not Essential.*

In the second place, our Church regards Baptism not as "essential" in its proper sense, but as "necessary." That which is properly "essential," allows of no degree of limitation; but that which is "necessary," may be so in various degrees with manifold limitations.

It is "essential" to our Redemption that Christ should die for us; therefore, without limits of any kind, we affirm that no human being could be saved without his atoning word.

It is "necessary" that we should hear the gospel, for it is the power of God unto salvation; but the necessity of hearing is limited in various ways. It does not comprehend both infants and adults, as that which is essential does.

#### VI. *But Necessary.*

The Augsburg Confession (Art. IX.) says, not that Baptism is essential, but simply that it is necessary—to which the Latin, not to show the *degree* of necessity, but merely its *object*, adds "to salvation."

In later editions of the Confession, Melanchthon, to remove the possibility of misconstruction, added a few words to the first part of the Ninth Article, so that it reads: "Of Baptism, they teach that it is necessary to salvation, as a ceremony

*instituted of Christ.*" So far, at least, we think all could go in affirming its necessity. And with such mild expressions, even those who were most remote from the Melanchthonian spirit, were satisfied.

"Among all orthodox Lutherans (and never has there been a stricter orthodoxy than the Lutheran,) Hutter is the most orthodox; no one has remained so thoroughly within the bounds of the theology authorized and made normative by the Church than he—no one has adhered with more fidelity, not merely to the spirit, but to the very letter of the Symbols, especially of the Form of Concord."<sup>\*</sup> Yet Hutter exhausts, in the following answer, the question: "Is Baptism necessary to salvation?" "It is; and that *because of God's command*. For whatever God has instituted and commanded, is to be done, is precious, useful and necessary, though as to its outward form it be viler than a straw."<sup>†</sup> So much and no more does this great Theologian say of the *necessity* of Baptism in his Compend. Later theologians have properly given prominence to its necessity as a *means*, but never have ascribed to it a necessity *per se*.

#### VII. *Yet not Unconditionally.*

For finally on this point, the Church never has held, but has ever repudiated the idea, that Baptism is "*unconditionally essential*" or necessary "*to salvation*."

She has limited the necessity, first of all, by the "*possibility of having it*"—has declared that it is not *absolutely necessary*, and that not the deprivation of Baptism, but the contempt of it condemns a man!—that though God binds us to the means, as the ordinary instruments of His grace, He is not Himself limited by them.<sup>§</sup> She teaches, moreover, that all the blessings of baptism are conditioned on faith.—C. M., 490: 33—36.

The "*Shorter Catechism*" of Luther, which our General Synod has issued, and authorized as a manual for training our children in the knowledge of the Gospel, teaches us that whatever Baptism gives, it gives alone to those "*who believe that which the Word and promises of God assure us of.*" "*The water cannot do such a great thing, but it is done by*

<sup>\*</sup> Herzog's Encyclop. fuer. Theol. VI. 346.

<sup>†</sup> Compendium Loc. XX. 3. This answer is taken from Luther's Larger Catechism.

<sup>‡</sup> Leipz. Edit. XXII. 400—422. <sup>§</sup> Do. p. 412.

the Word of God, and faith which believes the Word of God, added to the water." We shall not give the reference for this, as even the little children are supposed to know it by heart, nor stultify ourselves or our readers by adducing authorities for the catechetical doctrines of our Church.

THE JUDGMENT OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH FURTHER  
ILLUSTRATED.

The Lutheran Church, holds that Baptism is necessary to salvation, inasmuch as God has commanded it, and obedience to his commands, is necessary to salvation; and, furthermore, because he has appointed Baptism, as one ordinary and positive channel of his grace, through which channel we are to seek the grace it offers. But our Church denies, that, where the command cannot be carried out, because of a necessity of God's creating, the lack of the sacrament involves the loss of the soul.

*Luther.*

On this question, the language of Luther is very explicit. In his "Christliche Bedencken," published in 1542,\* in reply to the anxious questions of Christian mothers, he rebukes and forbids the superstitious practice of the Romish Church, of baptizing a child not fully born—a practice based upon the idea, of the absolute necessity of baptism, to the Salvation of a child, and which would find some justification in that theory.

He directs, that those who are present, shall hold firmly to Christ's words: "Unless a man be born again, he cannot enter the kingdom of God," and shall kneel down, and, in faith, pray that the Lord will make this (unbaptized) child, partaker in his sufferings and death, and shall *then not doubt*, that He knows full well how, according to his divine grace and pity, to fulfil that prayer.

Wherefore, since the little child (unbaptized) has, by our earnest prayer, been brought to Christ, and this prayer has been uttered in faith, what we beg, is established with God, and heard of him, and he gladly receiveth it (the child :) as he himself says, Mark 10: 14: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God." Then should we hold that the little child, though it has not obtained Baptism, is not on that account lost, ("das Kindlein, ob es wohl die rechte Taufe nicht erlanget, davon

\* Leipzig, Edit. p. 418.

*nicht verloren ist.”) There are several other passages in Luther, bearing on the same subject, but what we have given is ample.*

*Bugenhagen.*

This “Bedenken” of Luther, was accompanied by an Exposition of the twenty-ninth Psalm, by Bugenhagen, (Pomeranus,) which Luther endorses. The main object of Bugenhagen, in the Treatise, is to give consolation in regard to unbaptized children, over against, what he styles, “the shameful error, drawn not from God’s Word, but from man’s dreams, that such children are lost.” Bugenhagen,\* after teaching parents to commit to God, in prayer, their child which cannot be baptized, adds: “This shall we *assuredly* believe, that Christ receives the child, and we should not commit it to the secret judgment of God. To commit it to the secret judgment of God, is to throw to the wind, and despise the promises in regard to little children.” Both Luther and Bugenhagen discuss, at large, the arguments for, and the objections against, the doctrine of the salvation of unbaptized children, and demonstrate that it is no part of the faith of our Church, that Baptism is *absolutely* necessary; that is, that there are no *exceptions* nor *limitations* to the proposition, that, unless a man be born again, of water or Baptism, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.

LUTHER AND BUGENHAGEN condemn those who refuse to unbaptized children the rites of Christian burial, and who object to lay their bodies in consecrated ground, as if they were outside of the Church. “We bury them,” say they, “as Christians, confessing, thereby, that we believe the strong assurance of Christ.” “The bodies of these (unbaptized) children, have part in the joyous Resurrection—the Resurrection of life.” GERHARD, and all our theologians, so far as we are aware, without an exception, present and argue for the same views.

*Hoffman.*

Hoffman, (Tübingen, 1727,) to whom we owe one of the most admirable of the older Expositions of the Confession, says:† “It does not follow, from these words, (not born again of Baptism,) that all children of unbelievers, born out of the

\* Do. p. 412.

† Pp. 36, 37.

Church, are lost. Still less, is such an inference true, of the *unbaptized* infants of Christians. For, although Regeneration is ordinarily wrought in infants by Baptism, yet it may be wrought, extraordinarily, by an operation of the Holy Spirit, without means, which the Augsburg Confession does not deny in these words. It merely desires to teach the absolute necessity of the new birth, or regeneration, and the ordinary necessity of Baptism. On the question, whether the infants of the heathen nations are lost, most of our theologians prefer to *suspend their judgment*. To affirm, as a certain thing, that they are lost, could not be done without rashness."

*Fuerlin.*

Fuerlin says:—"In regard to the infants of unbelievers, we are either to suspend our judgment, or adopt the milder opinion, in view of the universality of the grace of Christ, which can be applied to them, by some extraordinary mode of regeneration."

*Our Theologians in general. Cotta.*

On the more difficult question, whether infants born out of the Church, are saved, many of our old divines, of the strictest school, have maintained that it would be harsh and cruel, to give over, absolutely, to condemnation, the infants of pagans, for the lack of that which it was impossible for them to have. This view has been defended at large, by Dannhauer, Hulsemann, Scherzer, J. A. Osiander, Wagner, Museus, Spener, and very many others. Some of our best theologians, who have not considered the argument on either side, as decisive, have suspended their judgment in the case, as did Gerhard, Calixtus, Meisner, Baldwin, Bechman, and others. HUNNIUS, whom Gerhard quotes approvingly, makes the statement of this middle view, in these words: "That the infants of pagans are saved, outside of the Church, is a matter on which the silence of Scripture forbids us to pronounce with assurance on the one side, yet, I would not dare to affirm, on the other, that those little ones, without distinction are lost.

For, 1. Since God desires the death of none, absolutely, it cannot rightly be supposed that he takes pleasure in the death of these little ones. 2. Christ died for them also. 3. They are necessarily excluded from the use of the Sacraments. Nor will God visit the children with eternal death,

\* Bechmann, *Annotat in Hutt. Compend.*, p. 658.

on account of the impiety of the parents. Ezek. 18. We commit them, therefore, to the decision of God."

COTTA approves of the most hopeful view of their condition, and argues for it—1. "From the infinite pity of God; 2. The extent of the benefits wrought by Christ; 3. The analogy of faith—no one is absolutely reprobated, but actual unbelief alone condemns; 4. Not the absence, but the contempt of Baptism condemns; 5. God can operate in an extraordinary way; 6. Though original sin, *in itself*, merits damnation, and is a *sufficient* cause of it, yet it is not (because of God's *infinite goodness*) an *adequate* cause of the actual infliction of that condemnation."\*

#### IX. *What, then, is Baptism? and what are its Blessings?*

By Christian Baptism our Church understands not mere water (Cat. Min. 361, 2,) but the whole divine institution, (Cat. Maj. 491, 38—40) resting on the command of the Saviour, Matt. 28: 19, (Cat. Min. 361, 2,) in which he comprehends, and with which he offers the promise, Mark 15: 15, (Cat. Min. 362, 8,) and which is, therefore, ordinarily necessary to salvation, (Aug. Conf. II, 2; IX, 1, 3,) in which institution, water (whether by *immersion*, Cat. Maj. 495, 65, sprinkling or pouring, Cat. Maj. 492, 45) applied by a minister of the gospel (Aug. Conf. V, 1 and XIV,) in the name of the Trinity, (Cat. Min. 361, 4,) to adults or infants, (Aug. Conf. IX, 2,) is not merely the sign of our profession, or of our actual recognition as Christians, but is rather a sign and testimony of the will of God toward us (A. C. XIII, 1) offering us his grace, (do. IX) and not *ex opere operato* (do. XIII, 3,) but in those only who rightly use it, that is, who believe from the heart the promises which are offered and shown, (A. C. XIII, 2; Cat. Maj. 490, 33,) is one of the instruments whereby the Holy Ghost is given (A. C. V, 2,) who excites and confirms faith, whereby we are justified before God (A. C., Art. IV, V, 3,) so that they who thus receive, or use it, are in God's favor, (A. C. IX, 2,) have remission of their sins, (Nic. Creed 9,) are born again (A. C. II, 2,) and are released from condemnation and eternal death, (A. C. II, 2; Cat. Min. 361, 6,) so long as they are in a state of faith, and bring forth holy works, (Aug. Conf. Art. XIII, 1, 6, Cat. Min. 362, 11—14,) while, on the other hand, where there is no faith, a bare and fruitless sign, so

\* Calovius Bibl. Illustrat. iv, 552.

far as benefit to the soul is concerned, alone remains (Cat. Maj. 496, 73,) and they who do not use their Baptism aright, and are acting against conscience, letting sin reign in them, and thus lose the Holy Spirit, are in condemnation from which they cannot escape, except by true conversion, (A. C. XIII,) a renewal of the understanding, will and heart, (Cat. Maj. 496, 68, 69; Form. Conc. 605, 70.)

This is the doctrine of our Church, and not one letter of it is destitute of the sure warrant of God's Eternal Word.

The intelligent examiner will soon discover, that while the whole sum and tendency of the *Romish* and *Romanizing* doctrine of the Sacraments, is to make them a *substitute for faith* in the justification of man, the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, in consonance with Holy Scripture, makes them a guard and bulwark of the glorious central truth, that "by grace we are saved, through faith; and that, not of ourselves, it is the gift of God." Her view of the nature of the efficacy of the Word and Sacraments, is the only one which solves the question: How God can be *Sovereign*, and yet *man* be accountable, and how the Church can at once avoid the perilous extreme of Pelagianism, on the one hand, and of Calvinism on the other.

#### X. *Baptismal Regeneration.*

The facts we have dwelt upon dispose of another charge against our Church—the charge of teaching an unscriptural doctrine in regard to regeneration, and the relation of Baptism to it.

The definite Platform (p. 29) says of "Baptismal Regeneration": "By this designation is meant the doctrine that Baptism is necessarily and invariably attended by spiritual regeneration, and that such *water Baptism* is *unconditionally essential to salvation*." "Regeneration, in its proper sense of the term, consists in a radical change in our religious views—in our religious feelings, purposes, habits of action." Do., p. 30. The Miami Synod, in 1858, set forth what they suppose to be meant by the charge, when "they utterly repudiate and abhor" (as well they may) the following error: "Baptismal Regeneration—that is, that Baptism is necessarily connected with, or attended by, an internal spiritual change *ex opere operato*, or from the mere outward performance of the act." (*Luth. Observ.* XXVI, 29.) Their definition and that of the Platform, are substan-

tially the same, though we do not understand them to charge such a doctrine upon their Church or its Confession.

The charge against our Church of teaching "Baptismal Regeneration," as those who make the charge define it, is, as we have seen, utterly ungrounded. It is not true in its general statement nor in its details; it is utterly without warrant in the whole, or in a single particular.

#### THE COUNTER-THEORY OF BAPTISM.

We have presented a few facts in elucidation and defence of the Scripture doctrine of Baptism, as confessed by our Church, and as misrepresented and assailed in the Definite Platform. It is always an interesting question, often a very important one, If we give up that which is assailed, what shall we have in the place of it? This question is of great importance in the present case. What equivalent do those propose to the Church, who ask her to give up her most cherished doctrines?

#### I. *Baptism of Adults. The Confession and the Platform Compared.*

What is the doctrine which the Definite Platform proposes as the true one, in place of that theory of "Baptismal Regeneration" which it denounces? It is this, (p. 30,) "Baptism in adults, is a *pledge* and *CONDITION* of obtaining those blessings purchased by Christ, and offered to all who repent, believe in Him, and profess his name by Baptism."

Now is not that which is a *CONDITION* of obtaining a thing, necessary to it—and is not "salvation" the generic term for the "blessings purchased by Christ?" How, then, can the Platform take offence at the ninth Article of our Confession. Just put them side by side?

Aug. Conf.: Baptism | is necessary | to salvation.

Def. Plat.: Baptism | is a *condition* | those blessings purchased  
of obtaining | by Christ.

#### II. *Baptism of Infants.*

Then comes the question of the Baptism of *infants*. What here is the view which is to supersede that annihilated theory (if that may be said annihilated which never existed) "that Baptism is a *converting ordinance* in infants."

The theory is this, (p. 31): "Baptism, in infants, is the *pledge* of the *bestowment* of those blessings purchased by

Christ, for all. These blessings are, forgiveness of sins, or exemption from the penal consequences of natural depravity (which would at least be exclusion from heaven) on account of moral disqualification for admission," &c.

Look now at this and compare it with what our Confession says on the Baptism of *Infants*. (Art. IX.) All that it says on the subject is,

1. "That children are to be baptized." Here the Platform assents fully.
2. "That by this Baptism they are offered and committed to God."

Here, too, we apprehend, there will be no dissent, for Dr. S. says: "Baptism in infants, is the pledge of reception into the visible Church of Christ, grace to help in every time of need."

3. "Being offered in Baptism to God, they are well-pleasing to God, (that is,) are received into the favor of God," says the Confession, and here it ceases to define the blessings of Baptism; but the Platform goes much further. "Baptism in infants," it says, "is a pledge." The first blessing of which it declares it to be a pledge, is "forgiveness of sins," conceding this, that infants have sins; that they need the forgiveness of sins; that *baptized infants* have the *pledge* of the forgiveness of their sins, and, of necessary consequence, that *unbaptized infants* have no pledge of the *forgiveness* of *their* sins; in other words, that there is no *pledge* that the sins of unbaptized infants are forgiven; for if they have the *pledge* too, though they have no Baptism, how can Baptism be the *pledge* of *forgiveness*?

The words that follow now, are explanatory of the preceding ones. "These blessings are forgiveness of sins, or exemption from the penal consequences of natural depravity." Forgiveness is defined to be "exemption from penal consequences." Sins are defined to be "natural depravity."

Now wherein does this doctrine differ from the old one, that in Baptism the "*reatus*," or liability of original sin is taken away, although the "*materiale*" remains? (Apolog. Confess., 83, 35.) Except, perhaps, in this, That Luther supposes God graciously to do it by his Holy Spirit *through* the Baptism, while the Platform may mean, that Baptism is only the *pledge* that it is done, but it is done either way, and in both—Baptism is the *proof*, at least, that it is done.

But we have, furthermore, a statement of what "the penal consequences of natural depravity" are: "Which would, at

least, be *exclusion from heaven*, on account of moral disqualification for admission."

Now analyze this proposition, and you have the following result :

1. That infants have natural depravity, which is a moral disqualification for heaven.

2. That this *natural depravity has penal consequences*, that is, is a *punishable thing*; that infants, *consequently*, *have moral character*, and some sort of *moral accountability*; are the *subjects of law*, as to its obligation, for they have sins to be forgiven; and of law as to *its pains*, for they are subject to "*penal consequences*."

3. That this punishment would be exclusion from heaven. But this statement is qualified in a very remarkable way—"would, *at least*, be exclusion from heaven,"—that is the *minimum*. The words "*at least* seem to mark this train of thought: "They would *at least* be excluded from heaven, even if they were not sent to hell." Now this style of thinking, as it has in it, unconsciously to its author, we trust and believe—as it has in it a tinge of Pelagianism—so it trembles, logically, upon the very border of that figment to which the Pelagianism of the Church of Rome, combined with her strong sacramentalism, leads her—the doctrine of a *limbus infantum*. She was too *sacramental* to admit that the original sin of a child could be removed without Baptism; too Pelagian to concede that original sin must, in its own nature, apart from God's grace, *bring death eternal*. Her *sacramentalism*, therefore, kept the *unbaptized child out of heaven*; her *Pelagianism kept it out of hell*, and the conjunction of the two generated a *tertium quid*—the fancy of a "*Limbus infantum*," or place, which, without being hell, was yet one of exclusion from heaven, a mild perdition, whereby infants not wholly saved, were, nevertheless, not totally lost. And the shadow of this *very tendency*, shows itself in the words we have quoted from the Platform.

Connecting the three propositions now, with what has preceded them, we reach then, furthermore,

4. That God grants forgiveness of the sins of the baptized infant, forgives its natural depravity, exempts it, of course, from the *penal consequences* thereof, and thus, if it is not saved from a liability to eternal death, it is, "*at least*," saved from exclusion from heaven. If the Platform means that the *sin of an infant, unforgiven, would bring eternal death to it*, then it goes as far as the *extremest views*

of the nature of original sin can go, and vindicates the very strongest expressions of the Confession on this point; and if it means that original sin would exclude it from heaven without consigning it to despair, it has virtually the doctrine of the *limbus infantum*.

5. And finally, Baptism in infants is the pledge of all this,—they have the *pledge*—and, of consequence, unbaptized infants have not. In other words, there is an *assurance* that every baptized child has this great thing, “*forgiveness of sins*.”

It is not surprising that, after all this, the Platform closes its discussion on this point with these words, (p. 31): “It is proper to remark that the greater part of the passages in the former Symbols, relating to this subject, are, and doubtless *may be* explained by many, to signify NO MORE THAN WE ABOVE INculcate.” We understand the author in this to concede, not simply that they are so explained, but that they are, in fact, susceptible of this explanation, and that this *may be* really their meaning.

It is our sincere belief, that if the energy which has been expended in assailing any doctrine taught by our Confessions, what they do not teach, had been devoted to ascertaining what is their real meaning, that these years of sad controversy would have been years of building up, and of closer union, not years of conflict, years in which our ministry and members have had their minds poisoned against the truth of God as held in our Church.

But, while there are apparent points of identity with the Church doctrine in that of the Platform, there is one *terrific chasm* in its theory, which nothing can bridge over. A contradiction of the most palpable and fatal character.

That vital defect is this, that while this theory secures the *forgiveness* of an infant’s sins, it makes no provision whatever for the *change* of its sinful nature. While it provides for its *exemption* from *penalty*, it leaves utterly out of sight the *correction* of its depravity, which is a more fearful thing than the penalty which follows it; for in the pure judgment of sanctified reason, it would be better to be holy and yet bear the penalty of sin, than to be sinful and have the immunities of holiness; better to be sinless, although in hell, than to be polluted and in heaven.

The theory concedes that there is in “*infants a moral disqualification for heaven*.” It absolutely needs, therefore, before an infant can have a *pledge* in Baptism of its salvation,

that there shall be a pledge provided for its moral qualification for heaven, and this moral qualification must be REGENERATION.

But the theory not only does not provide for this, but as far as it is stated in the Platform, absolutely excludes it. It says, "Baptism in infants is a pledge of the forgiveness of sins," but it says not a word of their *removal* in whole or in part.

The cardinal defect is, that it provides a pledge that the *blessings which follow regeneration* shall be given, but none that the regeneration itself shall be given—that the child shall be saved from the *penalty* of sin without being saved, in whole or in part, from the *sin itself*; saved in fact *in its sins*, not *from them*. To what end would a child enter heaven if its nature were unchanged. *Forgiving* a sin in no sense changes the character. And where in the word of God is there the shadow of that baleful doctrine, that *the sins of an unregenerate person are forgiven*; where the shadow of that deadly error, that God has provided a Church, into which, *by his own ordinance, and at his command*, millions are brought, without *any change* in a nature, whose moral evil is such as would condemn them forever to exclusion from heaven—where is the shadow of that fatal delusion, that the curse of sin can be removed while the sin itself remains dominant?

But if a refuge is sought in saying that infants are regenerated, but that Baptism, in all its parts, element, word and spirit, is not the ordinary channel of this grace, is to accept a theory which has every difficulty which carnal reason urges against the doctrine of the Church, but which has nothing that even looks like a warrant for it in God's Word, and which, run out logically, would destroy the whole character of Christianity as a system of wonderful means to beneficent ends.

#### CALVINISTIC AND LUTHERAN VIEWS OF BAPTISM COMPARED.

Dr. Heppe, in his *Dogmatik* of the Evangelical Reformed Church, (1861,) presents the doctrines of the Calvinistic Churches, and illustrates his text with citations from their *standard theologians*. The doctrine of the Lutheran Church, in regard to Baptism, is often very severely spoken of by Calvinists—it is, indeed, one of the main points of attack: Perhaps it may not be without some interest to compare the

Lutheran and Calvinistic views, in regard to this important subject, on a few points.

The definitions of Baptism which Heppe gives as purely Calvinistic and Reformed, are as follows: "Baptism is a sacrament, in which those to whom the covenant of God's grace pertains, are washed with water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that is, that to those who are baptized, it is *signified and sealed*, that they are received into the *communion* of the covenant of grace, *are inserted into Christ*, and his mystic body, the Church, are *justified by God*, for the sake of Christ's blood shed for us, and *regenerated by Christ's Spirit*." This definition he gives from POLANUS. Another and shorter one he furnishes from WOLLERIUS as follows: "Baptism is the first sacrament of the new covenant, in which *to the elect* received into the family of God, by the outward application of water, *the remission of sins and regeneration by the blood of Christ and by the Holy Spirit are sealed*." He gives only one other, which is from HEIDEGGER, thus: "Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration, in which *to each and to every one embraced in the covenant of God, the inward washing from sins through the blood and Spirit of Christ, is declared and sealed*."

This doctrine thus stated, and correctly stated, for it is the doctrine of all genuine Calvinists, involves several things, which the detractors of our Church may do well to ponder. First, It draws a line between baptized *infants* as well as between baptized *adults*, representing some as belonging to the elect, some to the non-elect, some as belonging to the class to whom the covenant of grace pertains, others as not of that class. Will Lutherans prefer this part of the doctrine to that of their own Church, which teaches them that God is the Father of all, and Christ the Saviour of all, heartily loving all and desiring to save them? Will a *Lutheran mother* believe that it is *possible* that between her two beloved little children prattling at her knee, there may be, in *God's love, will and purpose, a chasm cleft back into eternity, and running down to the bottom of hell*? Can she believe this when her conscience tells her that the slightest *partiality on her part*, for the one or the other, would be a *crime*? Can she believe that God's absolute sovereignty elects absolutely one of her children to eternal glory, and passes by the other, when that passing by necessarily involves its ruin forever? Can Lutherans wonder that High Calvinism has been the mother of Universalism—that men who

start with the premise, that the absolute sovereignty of God determines the eternal estate of men, should draw the inference, not that he elects *some* to life, and leaves the *mass* to go to perdition, but that he elects *all*? Will Lutherans give up this part of the baptismal doctrine of their Church? And yet if we surrender it—if we say the doctrine of Baptism is not a fundamental one in our system, men may teach among us on this point what they please. Who is to prevent these fearful views from being preached in our pulpits and taught in our houses?

A second feature of the Calvinistic view of Baptism is, that *to those perfectly alike in all personal respects, Baptism comes with entirely different functions.* To one infant it signs and seals *communion in the covenant, insertion into Christ, justification and regeneration*; to another, perfectly alike in all personal respects, it signifies and seals *nothing*. No parent knows what his child receives in Baptism, whether it be a mere handful of water on its hair, or the seal of blessings, infinite like God, and irrevocable to all eternity. The minister does not know what he has done; whether he has sealed the everlasting covenant of God with an immortal soul, or thrown away time and breath in uttering mocking words, to that little being which smiles and prattles, in utter unconsciousness that it is abandoned to a destiny of endless pain, of unspeakable horror. Can we give up the baptismal doctrine of our Church for this? Our Church tells us that Baptism makes the offer of the same blessing to *every* human creature who receives it; that a difference in the result of Baptism depends upon no lack of the divine grace, on no secret council of God, but upon the voluntary differences of adults—and that as there are no such differences in infants, there is no difference in the effects of Baptism to them. Surely Lutherans should stand shoulder to shoulder in this, that whatever be the blessing of Baptism, be it little or great, vague or well-defined, it is offered alike to all, and *conferred alike* upon all who do not present in themselves the voluntary barrier to its reception. Yet if we say the doctrine of Baptism is non-fundamental, these very errors we abhor, may be set forth in our theological chairs, taught in our Catechism, and set forth in our pulpits.

A third element of the Calvinistic doctrine of Baptism is, that to those for whom any of the blessings of Baptism are designed, it supposes the sealing of as *great blessings*, as on the strongest sacramental theory, even that of the Church of

Rome herself, is conferred by Baptism; it seals to the elect, to whom alone its blessings belongs, reception into the "communion, that is the fellowship in, the participation in, the covenant of grace," "insertion into Christ and his mystic body," "justification," "regeneration," and "the inward washing of sin." Let Lutherans remember that it is here conceded that the highest blessings which our Church teaches us are connected alone with a *worthy* entrance into the baptismal covenant, and a *faithful continuance* therein, are acknowledged by Calvinists to be actually *sealed* therein—that is, that God sets his hand to it, by the act of baptizing, that the elect do *then* have, or shall *yet* have, if they have not then, justification, regeneration, and inward washing from sin. Shall we take offence at the doctrine of our Church, which asks us to receive as an article of faith, in regard to the efficacy of Baptism, no more than is summed up in the words of our Confession, that "through Baptism the grace of God is offered, that *children* are to be baptized, and being through Baptism offered to God, are received into his favor?"

Here, then, we rest the case. The doctrine of Baptism held and confessed by the Evangelical Lutheran Church is, as all her doctrines are, absolutely accordant in every part with the Word of God. To abide by her Confession, is to abide by the Word, and there she and her true children will rest. If we destroy the historical life of our Church, and abandon her Confession, whither can we go? What system can we accept which will meet so fully our wants? If we destroy or rend the Lutheran Church, or allow as normal and final just as much deviation, as the individual may wish, from all to which she has been pledged in her history, from all that is involved in her very name, from all that gave distinctive being, what may we hope to establish in her place to justify so fearful an experiment, and to indemnify the world for so great a loss?

## ARTICLE II.

THE LORD'S SUPPER. FROM LUTHER'S ARGUMENT: "THE WORDS 'THIS IS MY BODY,' YET STAND FAST." TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN.

By Prof. C. W. SCHAEFFER, D. D., Germantown, Pa.

IF playing the fanatic were an art, I could play the fanatic as well as any of them. I could maintain that there is nothing but bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, and yet I could bring out something that none of them has ever hit upon. I would proceed in this way:

Dr. Carlstadt, in handling the text, "This is my body," puts to the rack the little word "this," Zwingle does the same thing with the word "is," Ecolampadius applies the torture to the word "body," and others do it to the entire text, so transposing the word "this," that it shall stand at the end and read in this manner: "Take, eat, my body which was given for you is *this*." Some, again, subject only half the text to the torture, putting the word "this" in the middle, and read it thus: "Take, eat what is given for you, *this* is my body." Others, again, torture the text after this manner: "This is my body in remembrance of me;" *i. e.*, it is not my natural body, it is only my body's memorial, as if the text should be read thus: "Take, eat, this is the memorial of my body, which is given for you."

In addition to all these, there is yet a seventh class, who say "This is not a fundamental article of faith, why should we dispute about it? Let every man be allowed to enjoy his own opinion, whatever it may be." These last trample it altogether under foot. Now all of these people claim that they have the Holy Spirit, and not one of them will admit that he is wrong, even in the face of these many confused and conflicting interpretations of the text. And yet there can be only one correct interpretation. So miserably does the devil mislead us!

Very well! Now these men have left nothing at all about the text for any other person to torture and pervert but the simple word "my." So I will undertake to stretch this word upon the rack, so that not a single bone of the text shall be unbroken, and that no person shall ever be able to lay hold

of any part of it, to torture any more. But I will show myself to be the best fanatic of the whole of them. I will neither turn the text upside down, nor disturb its order, nor interpret any word otherwise than according to its meaning in the Scripture. I will let every word stand as it stands, so that *Ecolampadius* may see that "body" does not, of necessity, mean "sign of the body."

Now my argument is simply this: When Christ says "Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you," his meaning is, as if he had said, "Moses, in the Old Testament commanded, that the bodies of irrational animals should be offered in sacrifice, *e. g.*, the paschal lamb. But I ordain another kind of body for the passover, *viz.*: bread, in order that every one may easily obtain it; for my disciples will often be very poor, and the sole intention of this sacrament is to keep up the remembrance of me." Now, that bread may be, and may be called the body of Christ, I can prove from the Scriptures much more readily than *Ecolampadius* can prove his "sign of the body." The Scriptures say, that all things are the Lord's, and all are called His. In the Law he calls the land of Judah his land. Our good works are his works, our words his words. In Hosea, the gold and the silver, the corn and wine and oil which the people prepared for Baal, were the Lord's. In 1 Cor. 15, Paul says that every thing has a body, and that God gives to every seed its own body.

Now from all this I can argue finely, that the meaning of Christ is only this, *viz.*: This bread in the sacrament, is his body which he has created; for, as God, he has created the body of everything and calls it his body. Now he has appointed this one solitary body of his to be his body after a peculiar fashion, *viz.*: to be eaten in remembrance of him. Therefore the bread may be called his body for two reasons; one, because he has created it, the other, because, in correspondence with the paschal lamb, he has appointed bread to be his body, that is, calls it a body for his own particular use, just as I call a knife my iron or steel, and a coat my cloth, because it is for my particular use, although I have not made the material of it, which God alone has done, nor the form of it, which the smith or the tailor has done. So Christ can call the bread his body, because he has made it and appointed that body for his own particular use. \* \* \*

If any one asks me, can you explain how the wine may be called the blood of Christ? I answer, O yes, very easily;

and I will not argue like Carlstadt does about Greek masculines and neuters, nor like Zwingle does about signs and things signified, I shall only use Scripture to prove that red wine is called blood, Gen. 49: 11: "He washed his garments in wine and his clothes in the blood of grapes." Accordingly, red wine is blood. Now Christ used the wine of the land, which is red. All wine is his because he has made it, and now as he has employed this wine for his particular use in the Supper, we must understand him as if he had said, "Moses shed much of the blood of animals in sacrifice, and used much red wine or blood of grapes in drink-offerings; but in the New Testament there shall be no necessity for such costly and expensive service. This red wine which is already my blood of grapes, shall henceforth be regarded by you as my blood, instead of all the blood and wine that has been hitherto required by the Law of Moses. In John 4, Christ says, 'My meat is to do the will of my Father which is in heaven,' because such doing may bear some resemblance to food. In like manner he may call red wine his blood, because it bears some resemblance to blood, and because the Scripture calls red wine the blood of grapes. Now I challenge *Œcolampadius* to furnish as good an argument from Scripture for his 'sign of the body.'

But you may say, Sir Martin, you are carrying it very high indeed! But what will you make out of this, that Christ adds, "given and shed for you for the forgiveness of sins?" Bread and wine are of no avail in the forgiveness of sins, even if they are broken and poured out upon the table. Answer. My dear sir, do you think that you can catch a fanatic with the Scriptures? I would be ashamed to be called a fanatic if I could not answer this. I would at least turn up my nose and cry out, "Now you are giving us only your own opinions and ideas." If that did not help me, I would stretch myself up and leap about until the very floor would crack under me, even if I should be lamed by the operation, and then I would observe, "Why you give me no Scripture, no Scripture proof of your position;" and if I could not get out of the difficulty in this way, I would deserve to be expelled from the Fraternity of Fanatics, for this is the very perfection of fanatical art.

Now do not watch me too closely, and see if I cannot get along after the manner of the fanatics. Bread and wine are eaten and drunk for the forgiveness of sins, that is, because Christ has appointed them to be taken, and that it should be

done in remembrance of him. Therefore it is very properly called an eating and drinking for the forgiveness of sins, because it is done in remembrance of such forgiveness, as he afterwards says, "Do this in remembrance of me," even as men sometimes drink upon closing a contract, in token of the fact that the contract has been made and is to be remembered.

But enough of playing the fanatic! Have not these words of Christ been sufficiently tortured, stretched upon the rack, turned inside out, twisted round and round? I think I have made out my case a little better than might be expected of a fanatic. But have patience with me, dear brethren, that I may for a moment defy the devil. These poor fanatics are yet too inexperienced to allow any seemingly good notions to slip away from them. Therefore whenever they dream any thing, they conclude at once that it is the Holy Ghost. O how many fine ideas and thoughts have struck me whilst reading the Scriptures, ideas and thoughts which I have had to let pass, and which, if they had occurred to a fanatic, all the types and presses in the world would not have been sufficient to print. Still, I believe that if my fanatical notions had occurred to any of them, to Carlstadt, to Zwingle, to Ecolampadius, it would not have helped them in the least, for it is only fanaticism, nothing more, and the words of Christ, "This is my body, which is given for you," still stand fast.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE ATONEMENT.

By Rev. CHARLES A. STORK, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

THE Bible deals with man as a being, disordered and in danger. It faces life as something out of gear and coming to ruin. God comes to man in his revelation as a physician to a sick man—as the the governor to the criminal. He comes to heal him; he comes to forgive and restore him, if he will only accept forgiveness and be restored. He comes to man as lost, to save him. The world is not atheistic: man believes in a God; but he is not willing to see God standing

in the attitude of Saviour to him. If God will only recognize man as on the whole right, and life as healthy and what it ought to be, man will receive such a God. But to recognize him as a physician, come to heal, is to acknowledge disease; to see in him the governor come with pardon, is to confess crime; to receive God as Saviour, is to accept the fact of sin. It is not congenial, it is not possible to the natural heart, to accept God's judgment on life—the verdict of revelation upon the state of man. That judgment is, that life is all wrong; that the motive of living, the end of living, the fruits of human life, are all contrary to the law of right and good. God, in the Bible, pronounces every man's life a failure: he declares that every soul is plunging downward to eternal ruin. It is a lost world; a world where death reigns, where every power is turned to poison, where every intelligence and will is set against law, and where only ruin is being wrought out. His whole revelation of himself in his Word, is as a holy God come to restore an unholy world. He says to every man you are a sinner against me: my laws you have broken, my creation you have defaced, my love you have abandoned; you are a rebellious and ruined being. Now if God comes to man with such an address, he can have but two ends that he proposes to himself, either the punishment of his rebellious and wicked creature, or his redemption and restoration. He cannot rest satisfied with man's view of life; he cannot pass over the disobedience and hatred of his creature, and treat him as obedient and loving. Man would shut up the whole book of sin and have no dealing with God on that subject; he would set up a natural religion, in which the service would be expression of thanks and an outward behavior of decency towards God, but not a word of broken law, of enmity against God, of the disease of depravity that is eating up the soul. Man says life is good enough; it may need some slight repair here and there, but there is no quarrel between God and us; we are what God intended us to be, and in the main we are doing what he expects us to do. Can God accept that? What is the unwavering attitude assumed in the Scriptures? That there is a deep and ruinous breach opened between God and man—that there is a quarrel. God declares that his creature has rebelled, broken his law and done him dishonor. He declares, furthermore, that he will honor his law, that he will punish the soul that breaks his law, that he must preserve

the order and justice of his moral kingdom. But in the Bible he presents himself as the restorer of that which was lost ; the one key-note of the whole revelation of God, from the first utterance of the promise to man, in the garden of Eden to the last assurance of the second coming of Christ, in the closing scene of John's vision, is salvation. God is making himself known to his guilty creature, not in wrath as the avenger of his broken law, but as the Redeemer from the curse of the law. The centre of the whole Bible is the doctrine of the atonement. Take that out and you wrench the key-stone from the arch and the whole structure of revelation falls into helpless confusion and ruin. These two ideas must throw light on every page of the Scriptures : Man a sinner and Christ the Saviour from sin. "*As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.*" All through we must hear that chord note of divine revelation: "*God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.*" The first great truth of God's Word, is that man is a sinner. It treats with him on that ground ; as a criminal against law, as one guilty, threatened with, and deserving, punishment for sin. "*Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of sin.*" That is what he came forth from heaven for, and for that work all the rest of the Bible is written, and for that all God's dealings with his people, before Christ's coming, were effected. Christ a sacrifice for sin, is the centre of religion, the heart of Scripture, the key to all the history of God's Church. Christ's work is based on the assumption that man is under the curse of the law ; Christ's work is to redeem him from that curse. What is that curse ? Paul quotes from the account given in Deuteronomy, where the Levites declared, in the presence of the people, "*Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them.*" What is that law ? It is that system of commands given of God to men on Sinai, which Christ summed up in brief, as supreme love to God, and charity towards our fellow-men ; a law written also on the heart and conscience. The curse of the law or the condemnation of the law, then, is upon every soul that has failed to do all things written in the law ; not only on the actual transgressor, but upon the soul that fails to realize the requirement of the law, and the law requires supreme love and service to God. The certainty that this curse of a broken law rests upon every soul, is made stronger

when we call to mind that further explanation of the nature of sin of the apostle James, when he says: "*Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all;*" for it is as much a failure to love and serve God, to break one commandment as to break every one. Before the first precept is transgressed, the soul must have ceased to love God, ceased to love holiness, and that is the breaking of the law of love, and that it is that has brought every soul under condemnation and under the curse of the law. We are guilty of sin, as for what we have not done, as well as for what we have done. We are cursed by the law, not as liars and dishonest, not as cruel or impure, no, but before all else, because made, creatures and children of God, like God, under obligation to God, we have thrown off our likeness, and refused to love or to serve him. We are all, then, under the verdict of our own consciences, under the curse of God's broken law; for none of us can say to God that we have loved and served him supremely. But what is this curse, threatened on those who break God's law? It is the declaration of God that "*The soul that sinneth, it shall die.*" A law without a penalty attached, is no law at all, but only advice. We can tell a man that he ought not to steal; we can remonstrate and counsel and argue with him how ruinous and wicked it is, but we cannot impose a law upon him, for we cannot punish him for stealing. But society can say *you shall not steal*, because it has the power to punish him if he does steal. We give advice; the state gives a law? You can tell your neighbor-boy that he ought not to lie, but you cannot give him a law not to lie, for you have no right to punish him if he does lie; but to your own boy you can give the law, and say you shall not lie, for you can put a penalty to your command, and enforce it. Now wherever there is any government, there must be more than the power to advise; there must be the power to command and to punish. We admit that in our families, in the state, in the nation, we have a law to restrain our children, and we punish for the breaking of that law. We have a law to keep down crime and penalties, threatened and executed on offenders. No man has any difficulty in seeing the necessity of penalty attached to law in all our governments, family and political. It is only when men come to talk of the government of God, that they leave their common sense behind; but it is reasonable, indeed, we cannot see how it could be otherwise, that God should affix a penalty to his law and punish the offender.

God affirms that he has a law, and that he will maintain it. He has declared "*The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God.*" This is the curse of the law from which Christ comes to redeem us; from the punishment that God has threatened upon transgressors, and which by his justice and truth he is bound to execute upon the guilty. But he proposes to save man from the curse of the law. His revelation in his Word is for salvation. The whole plan of God with respect to man, centres about Christ. What his Son is, that God is, and John declares that "*God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.*" These two great facts we must keep clear before our minds, if we would penetrate the meaning of the atonement and understand the mystery of godliness—God manifest in the flesh—that God has declared "*The soul that sinneth, it shall die,*" and "*That he sent his Son not to condemn the world, but to save the world.*" Man is a sinner, but God purposes to save him. But how can he do it? How can that character set forth by Paul be realized, "*That he might be just,*" that is execute his sentence of punishment on sin, and yet "*The justifier of him who believeth,*" *i. e.*, treat the sinner as if he were holy and save him from eternal death. Two things are required here: that God preserve his own character, as a just and true God, and yet save the criminal from the sentence of the law. On the one hand it is absolutely necessary that the law be upheld. What is a law with the severest penalties attached, if those penalties are always remitted? What character of just governor does he have who always pardons the criminal? What would we think of the character of a governor that should from pity pardon every murderer sentenced to be hung—every thief condemned to lie in prison? We would say he was unfit to govern, that he insulted the law and outraged every sense of justice. How then would God appear to all his universe, to us, if he should treat the sinner and the holy alike? We could not think him a holy or just being. We could not see anything excellent in his law. We would lose confidence in his character and feel unsafe under his government. We would feel that there was no government. Picture to your mind a God who would say to the murderer who comes, full of malice, dripping with blood, to the bar of judgment: "It is true, you have broken my law and injured my creatures; it is true, I threatened to punish you for transgression, but, on the whole, I have con-

eluded to let you off, enter into the joy of your Lord?" Such a conception of God is almost blasphemous. There is not a sinner who would not turn with contempt and distrust from such a God, who would not shudder to live under the government of a God who cares nothing for justice or truth, a God who could take murderers and adulterers and thieves into his company, and see no particular wrong in them. In such a case we see the impossibility of God's letting the sinner go unpunished, as God sees it in every case. We can see how justice and law and truth and the good of the universe and the character of God and our own moral sense demand it, as righteous and holy, that the murderer, the oppressor of the poor, the betrayer of innocence, must be punished; but God sees how every sin, the sin of the moral man, the sin of failure to love him, must as well be punished. Our sin, the sin of the most moral and amiable soul, God sees just as he sees the sin of the murderer and thief, and he can no more let the one go unavenged than the other. If God be God, he must maintain his law and punish sin. If he were to weakly yield and remit the righteous claims of his just and holy law, the very devils in hell would despise him, and every holy intelligence in his universe would tremble with fear lest the foundations of holiness should be removed. The law then must be honored by the execution of its sentence. It is very clear how God might maintain the honor of his law. If he should unhesitatingly turn every sinner into hell, he would uphold his moral government and set forth his character to the universe as just and holy; but where then were we, what our hope? In such a case there would be no Christ and no need of a revelation.

But God displays in his purposes another side of his character: he will not only keep his law intact, but he will also save the violator of that law. He will be just and yet the justifier of him that believeth. How can he do this? What can take the place of the sinner's just punishment? Can repentance and reformation? They cannot blot out the fact of past guilt. They cannot restore its lost honor to the tarnished law. The law knows nothing of repentance, only of the absolute precept and the executed penalty. Does it make any difference in human law that the robber repents? Does that repentance protect society and establish law and set forth justice? No one ever feels that. Some time ago a horrible murder occurred in Malden, Massachusetts: the young man deliberately waited for his victim, his own friend, and

shot him. After his arrest he was seized with remorse, he wept bitter tears of deep repentance, he gave every evidence of true sorrow for his crime; would we say forgive him? Do the citizens of Malden think of sending a petition to the Governor for his pardon, because he has repented and will probably never do the like again? No! he has been proved guilty of deliberate murder, the law has been violated, the majesty of government has been stained; justice, not vengeance, but righteous justice, demands his punishment. Carry this same case up to the courts of heaven; this man is guilty before that tribunal too; what shall he plead? his true sorrow? Does his repentance satisfy the law of God any more than the law of man? Can divine justice count his sorrow and tears for the satisfaction of its demands? No! justice does not ask for sorrow and weeping and contrition of heart, but for punishment; that alone expresses the righteous abhorrence of sin and the determination of the Divine Ruler that his government and kingdom shall be holy. Repentance, then, cannot redeem us from the curse of the law. What then can take the place of the sinner's punishment? Can any future holiness atone for past guilt? Suppose that the sinner were able to turn about and, from the hour of his reformation, live forever in perfect conformity to God's law, could that wipe out past guilt? Let him be absolutely holy, and he cannot do more than God commands, he can only love God with all his soul and heart, and that, says Christ, is only doing what it is his duty to do. Holiness cannot be more than enough for the present; it cannot cover or make up for the past. If a man rents a house and for the first two years pays nothing, but ever after, it may be fifty years, pays his rent regularly, does that cancel his first two years debt? Not, if he should pay rent for a thousand years. Now God demands of us, justly, that we love and serve him; we have refused to pay the debt of love for twenty years. If we could become holy this instant, and be holy for eternity, would that make good our failure to love God for twenty years? Do we say God will not be so exact? Yes, but he is exact. Every thing in the natural world moves by law; will he be less exact in matters of guilt and holiness? If the murderer of Malden could live for a hundred years a just and upright citizen, would that satisfy the law which justly ordains that the murderer shall die? If there could be such a thing, if we could render God from this moment, a perfect love and perfect service, as the angels in heaven, it would not

satisfy one jot or tittle of the law; justice would not see our future life, but fix its gaze only on that guilty past and inexorably demand satisfaction. But the case is impossible, there is no such thing as a perfect obedience of man to God. What shall take the sinner's place and redeem him from the curse of the law? Repentance cannot redeem him; future holiness cannot redeem him, be it ever so perfect; God cannot, as just and true, let sin go unpunished. See what demands, full of contradiction and apparently irreconcilable, meet over the sinner's head: God's justice demands the punishment of sin as a thing of guilt and deserving of suffering; God's law demands that it be exalted and established in the eyes of all the universe; but then God's mercy demands that there be pity shown to the wretched case of the ruined sinner. How can divine pity exercise itself for the release of the sinner and not tarnish the majesty of the law, and outrage justice? How can the law be avenged and justice satisfied, without the eternal misery of the sinner? Christ solved the difficulty; he redeemed us from the curse of the law, not by setting aside the claims of the law, not by refusing the righteous demands of justice, but by taking on himself the satisfaction of those demands he redeemed us from the curse, being made a curse for us. The sentence of the law was executed; every demand of justice was met, but not on the sinner, not by the sinner. The stroke descended as was threatened, as was necessary, but not on the sinner's head; no, but on the unbared head of the Son of God. The law demanded that a curse, a condemnation, the execution of the condemnation descend upon the sinner; the safety of God's government required that; but how if one present himself in the sinner's place, offer to receive the execution and punishment in his own person? Is not the law avenged? Is it not honored? Does not the suffering of the innocent for the guilty, of the divine for the human, of the God-Man for man, proclaim the awful sanctity of God's government, and the assurance unmistakable to every creature of the universe, that sin will not go unheeded, that God will never pass over guilt. Justice, as a part of God's character, demands that God express his abhorrence and aversion to sin by punishing the sinner; but how if one worthy offer himself as a victim, whose direful humiliation and agony and death may speak forth to the universe God's just anger against sin; whose sacrifice may speak to the utmost ages of eternity the dreadful ill-desert of sin? Does not that ex-

press God's justice as powerfully, set forth his truth and holiness as clearly, as the suffering of the sinner himself in hell? The law requires a curse upon the sinner, but Christ becomes accursed for our sakes; justice calls for death, but Christ dies; God's character demands that his holiness set the seal of its abhorrence against sin in the suffering of the sinner, but Christ suffers. The innocent suffers for the guilty; God redeems man: "*He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin.*" He that was not guilty is treated as if he were guilty; he stands for us; God looks on him, for the time, as the sinner; all our guilt is laid on him, and in that dreadful scene of the crucifixion we see the climax of that curse which he took for us, when the accumulated weight of all the sins of the race pressed upon his soul and he cried, "*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!*" Can we look on the mystery of God manifest in the flesh, behold the humiliation of the Son of God, his deep agony in the garden, and mystery of suffering and desolation when Christ hung on the cross and, with that forlorn cry, at last yielded up the ghost, and not see that here is the honoring of the law and the avenging of justice and the sealing of God's abhorrence of sin as expressive and forceful as would be the suffering of the sinner himself in hell. Could hell, populated with the whole guilty race of man, so proclaim the justice and exalt the holiness of God as the death of his Son on Calvary? How must he regard his law who could give up his only Son to agony and shame and death for its honor and vindication. The law and justice and holiness of God are asserted and enforced and made glorious as much as if the sinner suffered, and yet the sinner does not suffer, but Christ. This is the work of the atonement; the truth of God is set like the sun in the heavens, the law is magnified, God's holiness emblazoned with light, justice is satisfied, sin is held up as that abominable thing which God hateth; it is branded with a new baseness as that cursed power which slew the Lord of glory, and man is saved, the sinner is redeemed. What glories gather round that cross of Christ, once despised, now magnified! It is the star of glory in which gather, to burst on the astonished universe, the combined rays of God's justice, his holiness and his love. And the cross was reared for us; that glorious wondrous sacrifice was made for man. "Of how much sorcer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and

hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE SCRIPTURAL IDEA OF THE MINISTRY. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF PROF. DR. PLITT, OF BONN.

By Rev. J. D. SEVRINGHAUS, A. M., Richmond, Indiana.

To call the Minister a "Pastor," is both beautiful and to the point; for in the conception of *πατήρ* we have the whole meaning of the pastoral office. This conception distinguishes the minister from the congregation; it points out the dignity of his office and his duty to the congregation, the fact that he is bound to his people and responsible to the Lord of the Church. But both—his dignity and his duty—are united in him, as the Shepherd, by the most tender and holy of bonds—love. The *dignity* is not that of the autocrat, who does with the flock as he pleases; and the *duty* is not that of the servant, who can be compelled to work because he gets paid. The former ignores the hierarchical, the latter, the ochlocratic tendency in the Church. It contradicts the real meaning of the ministerial office, if the minister regards himself a lord of the faith; and no better is the other extreme, when the congregation looks upon the minister as a hired servant, with whom it would prefer to make a contract for the shortest time possible.

The Ministry has a true pattern in Christ. In John 10, he indicates three separate functions. Namely: 1. *He calls his sheep and they hear his voice*, (v. 3). This points to the ministry of the *word*, and intimates how those, who enter upon this spiritual vocation after Christ, are to use it, namely, to effect a *hearing* and a *following* of the Good Shepherd. So Paul, in 2 Cor. 4: 5, 6: "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in on our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of

Jesus Christ." And in 1 Cor. 1 : 5, 6, Paul thanks God, that the Corinthians are enriched in every thing by him, so that the testimony of Christ is confirmed among them. Again, Col. 1 : 28: We preach Christ, "warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." In 2 : 2, 3, he says that he labors to the end, "That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ; in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." 2. We have, in John 10 : 3, the shepherd leadeth out his sheep, and in verse 4, "He goeth before them." This points to guidance, which the sheep, collectively and separately, need, and the hearty supervision of all their interests. The *going before them* may point yet more especially to the personal character and example of the pastor, to which Paul, in Acts 20 : 28, draws special attention. The personal example is, indeed, the real condition, and entirely indispensable, if we would lead the Church. 3. Finally, we have in verse 11: "The Good Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." Jesus declares the giving his life to be the finishing act of the *diaxovēi*, where he says, (Matt. 20 : 28): "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Thereby he gives them life eternal. That this *diaxovēa*, in its fulfilment as manifested in Jesus Christ, demands nothing less, is evident from 1 John 3 : 16: "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."

From this we gather the fundamental principles of ministerial duty. It is, by *teaching, leading and serving*, to establish a living union with Christ. The elements of this union are: 1. Knowledge of Christ; 2. Imitation of Christ, or obedience towards him, and life in him; 3. Full satisfaction and contentment in him. From this it appears, and the nature of the case conditions this inference, that knowledge is the real root of the whole living relation to Christ. Instructing, therefore, is the principal duty of the ministry, and this we ought to remember. We should never think that we can gather a living congregation, or keep one, already gathered, alive by forms, either of organization or liturgical, though they be the very best. For thus says Christ, (John 17 : 8): "For I have given unto them the

*words which thou gavest me ; and they have receive them, and have known surely that I came out from thee.*" And the apostles were, above all, to give the *word*, which the Lord included in his prayer for the disciples, (v.20): "I pray for them, also, which shall believe on me through their word." It is, therefore, the *word*, first and last, which is to be presented.

From this we learn *what* the preacher must preach. He is to give the words which Christ gave his disciples ; he must proclaim the word of God, as it was understood by Christ and his apostles.

Since, then, the presentation of spiritual truth, is the most important of all pastoral duties, we must investigate this more fully. And we may start out with Tit. 2 : 7 : "In all things showing thyself a pattern of good works : in doctrine showing uncorruptness (*ἀδιαφθορίαν*), gravity (*σεμνότητα*), sincerity (*αὐθαρσίαν*)."  
The first thing, therefore, is, that our doctrine be characterized by *uncorruptness*. This is not the same as orthodoxy, it rather points to something more subjective ; namely, our inward and outward demeanor by the presentation of truth. Show in thy preaching "*uncorruptness*" of purpose, *unbestechlichkeit*, impartiality, purity ; so that you have no sinister motives ; that holy things be treated in a holy manner, and without aversion or favoritism toward any one. A man's doctrine may be correct, and yet not *uncorrupt* in this ethical sense ; another one may have false views, yet if he be sincere, an *anima candida*, he may possess this *ἀδιαφθορία*.

Next to this, the author mentions *σεμνότης*, something that pertains to the external exercise of the ministerial functions. But "*gravity*" must never be a studied performance ; therefore, to give a rule upon this subject, might lead to an outward adoption of dignity which has no inward meaning. The best rule is, that we live in the sacredness of the things which we handle, then will the inward impression of their holiness find a proper expression, in manner, voice, bearing and gesture. If we now look at the constituent parts of a sermon, we find three separate functions : *ἀναγγέλλειν*, proclaiming, *διδασκειν*, instructing, and *διαμαρτυρεῖσθαι*, exhorting, or the application with a personal assurance of its importance. Such St. Paul represents his work to be, Act. 20 : 20, 21 ; and of our Lord, it is recorded (Matt. 4 : 23 ; 9 : 35,) that he went about, teaching and preaching.

The first part is the mere proclaiming of the gospel tidings,

which is to make known the declared counsels of God, take away all ignorance, and render those, to whom this proclamation is made, without an excuse. This preaching is designed for all, is to be directed to all, and even those that do not receive it. This *ἀγγέλεω* must, first, include the whole counsel of God. Paul says (Acts 20 : 20) that he kept back nothing from the Christians at Ephesus, which was profitable for them; and in verse 27, he had not shunned to declare all the counsel of God. We do not forget that there may be points in the plan of salvation, which the preacher does not understand very clearly himself. I cannot give what I have not, and what I do not understand I cannot explain. But we want to make the point, that nothing must be kept back, either in a man-fearing, or in a man-pleasing, spirit. Things that we understand well enough, we often keep back, either from policy or cowardism, before the host of *Noli me tangere*, that confronts us in fashionable communities, as also in rural congregations. We must not give way to this temptation; we must keep our conscience clear, and remember the day of accounts. It may, indeed, be objected, that it is contrary to Christian propriety, to mention private affairs, that are often of the most delicate character, in the pulpit; our usefulness and influence may be compromised in that way, and the persons concerned become embittered, rather than benefited. There is a Christian sense of suitableness which must be respected. Nothing is more odious, than that a preacher should violate, what may be called, the decency of the pulpit. St. Paul, with his delicate sense of Christian decorum, was far removed from anything of that kind. But what we thus fail to mention publicly, out of consideration, both of those concerned, and others who know nothing about it, we must endeavor faithfully to reprove in a private way. Many things also might be mentioned publicly, if we could do it in the right manner, purely objectively and based on the Word of God, not after the manner of a stormy, raging preacher of wrath. We must, therefore keep nothing back, nor leave any sins unrebuked, either in public or in private. The second thought in connection with the *ἀγγέλεω* is, to add nothing to that which is given us. This can be done in two ways: We can add, to make the narrow way seem narrower, and the strait gate seem straiter, than they really are. It may be done by a narrow-hearted preaching of the law, and leaving the gospel of grace in the background, making piety to depend altogether upon externals.

Or, we may add, making the narrow way seem very broad. This is done by easing the sharp sword of the word of God, in all sorts of additions, blunting its edge by modifications, securing the conscience against its cutting rebukes, and making Christianity a system of fashion, that may change with every season, and be different in every country. We may thus pass for very kind and considerate Christian ministers, but it is based upon the fact that we wash people without making them wet. Such preaching is worse than to keep silent entirely about the essential points of the gospel; for the people may yet have their attention directed to them as something new, and realize their importance; whilst, when thus presented in a fashionable form, they learn to hear them without being moved. So much for the *árayyéðsuv*.

We come now to the second part, *διδάσκειν*. This presupposes that what was proclaimed has been accepted; for if I would *instruct* any one, I must have first announced the subject to him, *i. e.*, we must state the premises before we commence to reason. But, should it be asked, what is yet wanting, after the published tidings have been willingly accepted? We often think this would be all-sufficient; because we think that nothing more is necessary than to deliver the sacred message, and that this message be accepted; this is the cause of so much ignorance in religion, and the reason why so much Christianity lies dormant, does not enter practical life, and exercises no influence to control the disposition or the conduct of believers. What is proclaimed must be explained, developed, taught, or else it will remain lying in the hearer, like a talent wrapped in a napkin. The traditional truths must be applied to individual life; general truths must be made practical and special, or else people will not ponder upon them, nor observe that which the Lord has spoken. Yet that is the main thing. Matt. 28:20, the Lord enjoins upon his disciples: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." And John 14:21: "He that hath my commandments, and *keepeth* them, he it is that loveth me. The *λέγειν* is there when the preached word is accepted, but the *τηρεῖν* (observe, keep,) is to be effected by *διδάσκειν*, instructing, expounding, teaching. And this, again, has two functions, namely: 1. Developing and explaining; 2. Applying.

The first requires a more minute exegesis, an explaining of the text and context. The truth must be exhibited in connection with all truth—a work more difficult than the mere

proclaiming of the facts of the gospel. There are talented preachers who understand proclaiming in a masterly manner, and, therefore, carry an excitement with them; they make their hearers enthusiastic, arouse the sleepers, awake the careless, and become noted for their unexpected success, and manifest fruit of their work. But if you ask of them to indoctrinate their awakened congregations, they find themselves out of their sphere; it is not their gift. On the other hand, if any one be specially gifted in this way, he cannot expect such sudden results; he must content himself with a gradual development of the progressive tendency of spiritual truth. He does a work that cannot be seen but by the eye of faith; he cannot create an excitement, although he goes much further into the depth of saving truth. Such instructive preaching and explanation of Scripture, is quite rare. Bengel is a master in this, and Calvin has given us many profound views of the Word of God, even more than Luther, for Luther was more of an evangelist, a stirring proclaiming of the gospel. The old Wurtembergers, Rieger, Roos, Steinhofer, are, in this respect, to be recommended.

The second part would be *application*: this requires us to particularize, to develop the ideas, make them practical, and fit them to the different circumstances and relations of life. This is the practical talent. In this Schleiermacher excels in an eminent degree, as many of his sermons testify. It is not a random addition of loosely jointed inferences, but the *De te fabula narratur*, or, as Nathan said to David: "Thou art the man."

Upon the διδάσκειν follows, thirdly, the διαμαρτυρεῖσθαι. This is the personal address, the exhortation to accept the truth presented, and continue in it. So did Peter "testify and exhort," according to Acts 2:20. This practical *testifying* and *exhorting* always presupposes the *ἀναγγέλλειν* and διδάσκειν, and it must follow them, in order to make the sermon complete. Where there is preaching, there must also be testifying and exhorting, an earnest appeal to the audience. This really is the transition from the sermon to the pastoral care for souls, the confidential address, with reference to the dearest interests of the hearers. Not as if in the body of the sermon there were to be no exhortation, or that in the pastoral address there should be no preaching and teaching; but in the former the announcing and instructing, in the latter, the assuring and exhorting, should predominate. The latter must hinge upon *μετάνοια* and *πιστις*, (repentance

and faith); to this all our exhortation must be directed. Every preacher should ask himself the question frequently: "What is really my object? What do I aim at in my preaching? Do I really desire to see repentance and faith? Do I serve the Lord in patience and humility, or do I serve my fellow-man?" And further: "What would be really effective, in this my usual congregation, to bring about repentance and faith?" This is altogether the most important in our homiletical meditation, that we seek, not how we may become interesting, sensational and witty, but rather, how we may carry conviction to the conscience, and so treat the text as to effect repentance and faith.

But besides preaching, which includes these three parts, the pastor must *lead* and *minister*, or *serve*.

By the first of these duties, we understand what in the New Testament is called *ἐπιοχοσείν*, or *ποιμανεῖν*, in the narrower sense of these terms. This is purely a spiritual function, not an external beaurocratic administration of the govermental affairs in a congregation, but rather a watchful diligence in all those duties that help to keep the soul in the fear and in the love of God, and to protect it againts injury. Hence Paul says to the elders of Ephesus: *προσίζετε πάντι τῷ ποιμνῷ*. Our Lord illustrates this disposition most beautifully. Matt. 9:36, we read: "When he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them." Here is our example. With compassionate love we must attend to our work. This love is based on the love of God toward us, and a realization of the condition of those whom we are to lead. The Lord pitied them, because they were as sheep without a shepherd; *ἐσχύλευον καὶ ἐπριμένοι*, "They fainted, and were scattered abroad." And this "fainted" means, they were *lacerated*, *wasted*, *fatigued*; this, indeed, is the true condition of the inner man, where the higher refuge is not known, and the inner peace is not enjoyed. Such are *lacerated* by the endless desires that arise in the heart; the secular interests, which find no counterbalance within, and the thousand occurrences of the family, which disturb the equanimity and *waste* the soul. Thus man is confused and fatigued, and his appreciation of the heavenly is blunted. The love of truth disappears, more and more. He needs a shepherd to guide him, to instruct, counsel and admonish. This state of things may be brought about, also, by too much religious experimenting, as in the time of Christ, when the people "fainted" because of the mass of human ordinances; so, in our day,

when all sorts of doctrines are preached, and extremes meet extremes. Truth suffers thereby. Indeed there is no word which describes the present condition of the masses more truly than this *ἴσχυρόν*. We shall not err greatly, if we take for granted, that a natural man is an *ἴσχυρός*.

And now the *ἴσχυρόν*, from *ἴσχημος*, scattered, tossed, confused. In the time of our Lord, the Israelites were "scattered abroad" by political factions. There were political zealots, enraged patriots and Herodian sycophants of Rome; there were infidel Sadducees, orthodox Pharisees, and ascetic Essenees. Where should the poor people find a refuge? It was a continual *βίαιόν*. And yet we may assert, that the *βίαιόν* is now even more violent than it can have been in those days. Life, in general, is now more in commotion than it was, even an hundred or fifty years ago. Look at the shiftings in society, the excitement, the restless agitation in the political and religious world! Has one storm passed over, a new one comes up. Our whole public life is swallowed up in party aggrandizements. And what enters deepest into the living issues of the day, is the political scheming. The religious agitations of the day, are, in many cases, resulting from, and auxiliary to, this. Men, who care nothing about religion or the Church, place themselves at the head of Church movements. People who can not form a judgment of their own, like to follow such demagogues, and are made raving by men who have nothing more than a churchly appearance. Such commotions of the people are best prevented when political excitements first arise. This, then, is the *βίαιόν* whereby the people become *ἴσχυρόν*.

But we must not forget, that however sad the condition of the masses be, there is, nevertheless, much that is noble and praiseworthy to be found. And the more manifest will that which is excellent appear, as we approach the people in the spirit and after the example of our Lord. We often find that we can do more with worldly people, who have never yet been seriously approached by religion, than with people that are well-drilled and schooled in the methodistic and pietistic forms. The former soon acknowledge that they lack something, and it is not hard to awaken a longing for something higher, within them; they then have not such deep-rooted prejudices to overcome, and they manifest more readiness to surrender themselves. When we meet with such a case, ought it not to move us to compassionate them in love?

It must be remembered yet, that the Lord indicates *why*

the condition of that multitude was so sad, namely: *they were as sheep without a shepherd.* The fault, therefore, is with the leaders, with those who assume the pastoral oversight. We have no reason to doubt that Church and school affairs of those times were well organized. There were synagogues in great numbers, priest, teachers, scribes, in multitudes, and yet the people are represented as *sheep without a shepherd.* Thus it may be among us. Churches and schools may be well organized; there may be no lack of teachers and preachers; Church ordinances and regulations may be all that is desirable, yet the people might appear to the Lord, as though they had *no shepherds.* We are inclined to think more about our ministerial *rights*, than about our ministerial *duties*. We look for the cause of the lamentable condition of society, in the people, and not in ourselves. Every thing is burdened upon the people, and they often feel that the blame ought to rest somewhere else. This creates a separation, a gulf between pastor and people, so that, finally, the whole relation they sustain to one another, ceases to be intimate and personal, and degenerates into a mere official discharge of public duties. Hence the want of confidence. We are looked upon as office bearers that labor for pay; the thought not unfrequently finds utterance, that we are not really necessary, and that the money might be spent for something more useful. Such, indeed, is thoughtless and bad reasoning; but the question is: do we not give occasion for it? May we not seek to humble ourselves, and improve by it?

From all this we may gather what it is, to lead a people, to care for their souls, guide them and keep them on the way to glory. Want of room forbids us to expatiate upon this theme.

We now come to the third function of the pastor, the *diazovēiū*. He must preach well: proclaim the gospel, instruct upon it, and exhort to it. He must lead well: embody in his own character the doctrines which he preaches, and exemplify them in his affectionate care for the salvation of those over whom he is placed; he must also *minister*, or *serve*, well. The alleviation of temporal wants, must illustrate the abounding grace and spiritual provision of the gospel. Paul, even after deacons had been appointed, attended to the temporal wants of the saints; and in after times, the care for widows and orphans, was regarded as one of the

most important duties of the bishop. The whole care for the poor, with its varied duties, must not now be laid upon the minister, but he is to direct and superintend the work. The temporal and spiritual concerns of man cannot be separated, as James, 2: 15, 16, declares; therefore, the pastor dare not even if he would, be indifferent to the wants of the poor and of the needy.

In conclusion, it is evident, from all that has been said, that *faithfulness* is even a more necessary qualification of the minister, than talent or skill. So Paul testifies in 1 Cor. 4: 1, 2: "It is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful." This *faithfulness*, as well as faith itself, is both subjective and objective. It may be quite correct in the *fides quæ creditur*, but the *fides qua creditur* may be quite different; and *vice versa*, the *fides qua* may be there, yet the *fides quæ* be quite defective. So it is with official *faithfulness*. Subjectively, we must want to be faithful; it must be our desire to win souls. This is something great; and where this earnest *faithfulness* exists, the blessing of the Lord will be added, in spite of our imperfections. Objective *faithfulness* requires us to administer the affairs of the Lord's house properly, and freely impart the spiritual riches, do our duty in *preaching, guiding and serving*. Moses is extolled for such *faithfulness*. Christ was faithful in this sense. Let us strive, not for high things, but to be faithful!

---

## ARTICLE V.

### REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

THESE monographs are presented from time to time, in the pages of the *Review*, with the desire to rescue from oblivion material which might otherwise be lost, and to aid the future historian in the preparation of a more elaborate work on the history of our Church in this country. It accords, too, with the genius of our Institutions to honor the memory of the worthy dead, and to embalm their deeds. The Word, as well as the Church, of God, also, authorizes us to distinguish the good, by illustrating their virtues and recording their services. When men, fitted, by talents, learning and grace,

for the most important positions, in the very beginning of life, are stricken down, when the brightest anticipations are cherished in reference to their public career, and the Church mourns their early departure, it is proper that their brief record should be preserved, and their influence perpetuated by the contemplation of their excellencies. Sometimes the youthful herald of the cross, full of zeal and devotion, as well as the veteran who has labored faithfully for more than half a century in the ministry, is arrested in his course, and, in the morning of his promise and the vigor of his strength, required to lay aside his work. If the subjects of the present paper had lived, there is every reason to believe, that they would have amply justified the high confidence reposed in them, and fully sustained the sanguine expectations which their early success awakened. Although many a fond hope lies buried in their grave, it is a consolation to know, that the Master called them up higher, from their earthly toil to their heavenly rest, that their death, so premature to us, was to their pure and sanctified aspirations, the possession of all that was most precious. The designs of Providence are always wise and good, though often inscrutable. We can only bend before a dispensation which we cannot comprehend, and reverently say, "God's will be done." It is always our duty to submit with humble and cheerful resignation to the decree of Him "who standeth in the congregation of the mighty," and "who judgeth among the gods."

## LXIII.

## JOHN SAMUEL CRUMBAUGH.

The subject of the present sketch, was the son of John D. and Susan Baugher Crumbaugh, and was born in Woodsboro', Frederick County, Md., on the 7th of November, 1831. His early youth was marked by a freedom from all immoral tendencies, by precocity of intellect, and a thirst for knowledge. He remained at home with his parents, enjoying the ordinary educational facilities which the village school afforded, till he reached his fifteenth year, when he entered the Preparatory Department of Pennsylvania College. His youthful ardor, the zest with which he pursued his studies, the care and accuracy with which he prepared his recitations, made, at the time, a deep impression upon our mind. His memory was remarkably retentive, so much

so, that with very little effort apparently, he could repeat page after page from the Latin and Greek Grammar without the omission of a single word. This gift did not, however, seem to be developed at the expense of his other mental faculties. His perceptions were clear, his judgment sound and his taste exact. His mind seemed well-balanced and indicated a very practical turn. He was regarded by all, as a faithful and successful student. He occupied a high position in his class, was equally distinguished in all the departments, enjoyed the confidence of his instructors, and among his associates exerted a more than ordinary influence. During his connection with the Institution, he became a Christian. We distinctly remember the first conversation we had with him on the subject of personal religion. We found him alone in his room, disposed to listen to the truth, as we earnestly urged the immediate surrender of his heart to God. We left with him a *Tract*, which he promised to read, and asked him to attend the Sabbath morning meeting for prayer, to which he consented. He, also, agreed to join the Catechetical class, the instructions of which were blessed to his eternal good. He experienced a change in his religious views and feelings, and united with the College Church in the spring of 1848. His decision on this occasion had, no doubt, an important bearing on his subsequent course as a student, and influenced his whole future career. He never seemed to forget the scenes of that winter, and always gratefully referred to the occasion. In a letter, now lying on our table, written in 1855, in commending to our sympathy and interest a young man, in whose spiritual welfare he felt a special interest, he says: "An hour, now and then, spent with him, will keep his convictions open, and save him. Act the part towards him, you did towards me, and you will have your reward. Bread will return, when cast upon the waters."

Mr. Crumbaugh was graduated at the *Annual Commencement*, in 1851, the exercise assigned him on the occasion being the Valedictory of his Class. That same autumn, soon after his final examination, he was appointed Principal of the High School in Lancaster, Pa., a position to which he appeared specially adapted, and the responsible duties of which, for two years, he discharged with signal success. Whilst thus engaged, he also prosecuted his theological studies, under the direction of Rev. Dr. Baker, and, in 1853, was licensed to preach the gospel. His first and only charge was St. John's (the second) Lutheran Church, of Lancaster,

a colony from that of Holy Trinity. His health, never very vigorous, began soon to fail under his pastoral labors, to which he had assiduously devoted himself, and a vacancy having occurred in the office of Superintendent of Common Schools for Lancaster County, he was appointed to fill it. He accepted the appointment in the hope that an opportunity for the resuscitation of his health would be afforded in the active exercise required. The following year he was elected to the office, by the School Directors, for the legal term of three years. His health, however, continued to decline, so as to render him unfit for pulpit service. He, therefore, resigned his pastoral charge in 1857, and devoted himself exclusively to the duties of Superintendent. Although he was so feeble as to preclude all hope of recovery, and often suffered great inconvenience from disease which, from day to day, was gaining the ascendancy, his work was never suspended, until the summons reached him. Four days previous to his death he examined thirty teachers, who were applicants for schools in the County. He ceased from his labors only when he ceased to breathe. He yielded to no depression of sadness. His faith never faltered. As his end approached, his throat and lungs were in such a condition as to render speaking difficult. But he was very calm. To a ministerial brother who sat by his side, he said: "I have heard my last sermon; I have preached my last sermon. All is well; all is well!" Death had no terror for him. He felt that the everlasting arms were underneath and all around him. His best friend was near him; he could not fear. He died on the 13th of January, 1859, in the 28th year of his age.

The death of Mr. Crumbaugh was appropriately noticed by the Vestry of his Church, and by the Board of School Directors. Both bodies bore unequivocal testimony to his ability and faithfulness in the positions which he had occupied. The Vestry requested of his friends permission to bury his body "in front of the Church he loved so well, and for whose prosperity he had so ardently labored." The School Board, at a full meeting, in which Judge Hayes, T. H. Burrowes, LL. D., and G. F. Krotel, D. D., paid glowing tributes to the sterling virtues and manly independence of the deceased, unanimously declared that the "learning, zeal, urbanity, and sound practical sense of John S. Crumbaugh, in the discharge of the various and difficult duties of the office of County Superintendent, were unsurpassed," and resolved

that his name should be added to the list of the most worthy of the deceased citizens of Lancaster, "as that of one whose brief life was a record of learning, usefulness and honor." Universal and profound was the impression of sorrow which the bereavement produced in the community. The clergy of the city, the School Board, the teachers of the public schools, and the present and former pupils of the High School, attended his funeral, composed of a concourse estimated at from four to five thousand persons. The services, in which Rev. D. Steck, Rev. G. F. Krotel, Drs. Harbaugh, Hodgson and Powell, took part, are said to have been of a most impressive character, and worthy of the solemn occasion. The Press, secular and religious, fittingly noticed his death. One of them concluded an article with the following language: "He was endowed by nature with talents of a high order, and to these he added the advantages and adornments of learning. Few men lived to better purpose. Indeed, he accomplished more good during his brief career as a public man, than men of less energy of character with equal opportunities would accomplish, though they should reach the period of three score years and ten. He is missed among us now, and long will be missed. He died as he lived, a humble Christian. His labors are ended and he has entered upon his rest."

Mr. Crumbaugh's brief, but successful, career sustains us in the impression, that he was a man of more than ordinary abilities. Possessed of a mind of remarkable scope and activity, which he had faithfully improved, with a fund of information, gathered from every source, and a rare command of language, he adorned the positions in life to which he was called. As a teacher, no one questioned his superior qualifications. He was successful, both in communicating knowledge, and in securing the confidence of his pupils. He knew how to exercise discipline without exciting odium, or awakening a personal prejudice. He possessed tact. His administrative powers were of a high order. He loved the work in which he was engaged. Its duties were never irksome. His heart was in warm sympathy with the young.

As a Pastor he was laborious and eminently useful. His people were most devoted to him. Success followed his efforts. The Church prospered. God owned his ministry. The Spirit quickened the Word, and many were added to the Lord. His preaching made an impression. It was strongly evangelical and highly instructive. It was clear, persuasive

and bold. There was in it a peculiarity of thought, a religious experience, an air of sincerity and earnestness, and often a glowing elocution, which arrested the attention and affected the heart. The application of his discourse was always forcible and direct, and often exceedingly pungent. The only production which he ever published, was an Address on "*God in History*," delivered before the Literary Societies of Franklin & Marshall College, in 1855.

As a man, he was noted for his conscientiousness. This was apparent in every duty which he assumed, in a most faithful regard to his official obligations, and a promptness in meeting every engagement. In his views of truth, he was enlightened and independent. He usually made up his mind for himself, without much regard to the sentiments of others, and when he came to a conclusion, he was not easily induced to swerve from it. He was very self-reliant, firm in his convictions, and fearless in the expression of his opinions. His was a very practical character. He seemed to understand human nature, the workings of the heart, and knew how to reach men. He possessed common sense in an eminent degree. He was ambitious, but his ambition was of that elevated, philanthropic type, which seeks distinction by means of the benefits which it confers, and not of that baser kind which merges the interests of all others in its own advantage.

"His zeal involv'd  
No element of self, but, hand in hand,  
Walk'd with humility, nor knew a tinge  
Of bigot bitterness."

There were, perhaps, in his character, also, defects. These he frankly admitted. He often lamented his short-comings, and, to his intimate friends, spoke of his inward conflicts. He was ever ready to acknowledge his error and to make reparation for any injury he had done. For a brief period, when at College, his Christian character seemed to suffer. He became somewhat careless and indifferent to his religious duties. His Christian influence suffered. But it was only a temporary aberration. We shall never forget the distress of mind he experienced when awakened to a sense of his guilt, and how, in the presence of his classmates and companions, at the social meeting for prayer, he confessed with anguish of soul, his deviations from duty, and sought the forgiveness of his Heavenly Father. No one who knew him, could, for

a moment, have doubted his Christian character, or have supposed that the service of his Divine Master was not the supreme joy of his life.

Mr. Crumbaugh was married on the 20th of June, 1856, to Susan, daughter of Rev. William Beates. His widow, with one child, John William, is still living in Lancaster.

## LXIV.

## THOMAS WILLIAM KEMP.

Thomas William Kemp was born at the paternal home, the residence of his father, in Frederick County, Md., December 2nd, 1833. His parents, Col. Lewis and Rebecca C. Kemp, were members of the Lutheran Church, and early dedicated their son to God in Baptism. Under the influence of faithful Christian nurture, his religious principles were successfully developed, and the foundation of his character laid. His mind was imbued with a knowledge of the great truths of the gospel, and these truths, through the influence of the Holy Spirit, became the controlling principles of his conduct. The testimony comes to us: "That Thomas was always a good Christian boy, and observed the precepts of his now sainted mother, who trained him to be a follower of his Saviour." His childhood and youth were characterized by an exemption from every thing vicious, by unusual sprightliness, and an eager desire for study. His earlier years were spent at school in Baltimore, whither his parents had removed, when he was yet a child. He was, for some time, a pupil of Rev. William H. Smith's Institute, and, for four years, was connected with St. Mary's College. In his fifteenth year he was matriculated as a student of Pennsylvania College, but an injury, sustained from an accident by cutting his knee with a hatchet, which confined him to the house for several months, led to his temporary withdrawal from the Institution. On his recovery, in the further prosecution of his studies, he spent about a year with Rev. Dr. Webster, of Baltimore, and lived the greater part of his time in his family. "I never had occasion," writes the Doctor, "to chide him for any thing, not a word, not an act. It was a delight to have him with me. All the anxiety he occasioned was by a disposition to overtask himself in his studies; and I found it necessary to take him with me daily in my pastoral round to keep him from his books." In the summer

of 1850, he renewed his baptismal vows, and became a communicant member of the First Lutheran Church, Baltimore, then under the pastoral care of Rev. Dr. Morris. In 1851, he returned to College, at Gettysburg, and was distinguished for his attention to study and his fidelity in the discharge of duty. His tasks seemed pleasant to him. He was deeply interested in his work, and won the hearts of all his teachers. During his whole connection with the College, there was nothing ever uttered to his reproach, or his disparagement. He was graduated in the autumn of 1853, delivering, on the occasion of *Commencement*, the English Salutatory. His youthful, delicate appearance, his bright face and graceful manner, carried with him the sympathies of the audience, and made a marked impression.

To the work of the ministry, Mr. Kemp seems to have been self-moved, so far as any human agency was concerned. His convictions of duty, produced by the truth and the influence of the Spirit, led him to abandon the study of the Law which he, at one time, cherished, and to devote himself unreservedly to the preaching of the gospel. He believed, in his own words, "that he could thus serve God better, and do more for his kingdom on the earth." In response to the inquiry, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" the path of duty seemed clear, and he was very happy in his decision. He commenced his theological studies under the direction of Drs. Morris, Seiss and Webster, all of them, at that time, Pastors of Churches in Baltimore, and completed them in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, under the instruction of Professors Schmucker and Krauth. Whilst a student in the Seminary, there was a higher development of his religious life. He became a most earnest Christian, and enjoyed communion with his God. "My soul," he writes at this time, "has been filled with joy, even to overflowing. Oh, how good is God, through Jesus Christ, to bless me, so unworthy as I am, so richly! I feel resigned to the whole will of Providence, that whether I live or die, I shall be with Christ." At another time he writes: "I have determined, with the help of God, to abandon everything that is unworthy of a man and a Christian. I trust I may have strength given me from on high. During my studies here at the Seminary, I believe my soul has gathered rich jewels in heaven. Living or dying, may I be Christ's, during the year upon which I have entered! I have prayed, and still do pray, that I

may live a more devoted Christian." He was most deeply interested in the spiritual welfare of those around him. He sighs for usefulness, and rejoices in the conversion of souls. His Diary is full of expressions of love and of burning zeal for those with whom he was associated, who were yet "strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." For their rescue from eternal ruin he continually labored, and implored the interposition of divine grace. His exertions and prayers, we have reason to believe, were not unavailing. There are those in the ministry who trace their first serious impressions, the first beginnings of their religious life, to the influence of his efforts for their spiritual good whilst he was yet a student.

He was commissioned by the Synod of Maryland, at its meeting in 1855, to preach the gospel, and soon after was, for a brief period, associated with the Rev. Dr. Stork in the pastoral work of St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia. In the spring of 1856, he was appointed by the Executive Committee of our Home Missionary Society, to take charge of a Mission Church, in Chicago, Ill. In this position he labored diligently and successfully, for nearly a year, gathering around him a host of friends and attaching to him particularly the young men of the city, when, the climate proving unfriendly to his physical constitution, he was compelled to retire from the field. In search of health he embarked for Europe, June, 1858; spending the summer, autumn and winter in Germany, France and Switzerland, early in the spring of 1859 he visited Italy, crossed the Mediterranean into Egypt, passed thence into Palestine and other countries; returning again to Europe, he remained for some months at the University of Berlin, sitting, with the greatest enthusiasm, at the feet of learned teachers and storing his mind with useful knowledge. Whithersoever he went he sought opportunities for improvement. His eyes were continually open. A shrewd observer of men and of things, his mind was occupied all the time; a stranger nowhere, a friend to all whom he encountered, his soul was full of exhilaration and enjoyment. Interesting reminiscences of his journey are given in a series of letters, published at the time in one of our Church papers. He reached this country, December, 1859. He preached occasionally, and delivered, with great acceptance, at different places, several Lectures on the Holy Land. He was, also, engaged in the preparation of a narrative of his Foreign Tour for publication, but the work was

never completed. His health gradually became more feeble. Disease, which no human power could charm away, no skill or science avert, had already with an iron grasp seized hold of his earthly tabernacle. He returned from his pilgrimage abroad, but to die in the midst of the joyous scenes of his childhood, and surrounded by the fond attentions of those whom he loved so well. Conscious he was of his approaching end, yet no gloom, not a single cloud passed over his dying couch. Although suffering from disease, he was uncomplaining, cheerful, affectionate and happy. His last hours were spent in conversing freely with loved ones around him, in bearing testimony to the preciousness of Christ and his gospel, and in sending communications to distant friends. His final message to us was: "That his faith in the Saviour was unshaken, that his Christian principles were sufficient to sustain him in the trying moment which was before him." Full of peace and hope, in the exercise of the most serene and trusting spirit, he quietly fell asleep on the morning of the Sabbath, September 15th, 1861, thus entering at once upon the employment and eujoyment of the everlasting Sabbath on high.

"So fades the summer cloud away;  
So sinks the gale when storms are o'er;  
So gently shuts the eye of day;  
So dies a wave along the shore."

On the occasion of his funeral, appropriate services were held in the Lutheran Church, at Frederick, in which the several pastors of the city participated, and Rev. Drs. Diehl and Butler delivered addresses. The remains of our dear young brother were then conveyed to their final resting place, in the beautiful cemetery of the city, to await the resurrection morn.

One of our Church papers, in an obituary referring to the early removal of the deceased, "so lovely and so beloved," says: "In the death of the Rev. T. W. Kemp, the Church has been called to mourn the loss of one of her most promising ministers. Extraordinary social culture, manners of remarkable delicacy and attractiveness, the peculiar charm of delivery, the power of winning all that approached him, these were characteristic gifts of him who has gone down so early to his grave. The mysterious providence which gave his life so early to the touch of disease and to the forebodings of death, was sanctified to him. None who met him on his return from his long and, alas! unsuccessful

pilgrimage after health, need be told how ripened, how pure and exalted his piety had become. Gentle, calm, full of anticipations of heaven, were his last days, and he has passed, not too soon for him, to that land where alone his spirit could find a congenial home." Another remarks: "Those who knew Thomas William Kemp, will never forget his tall, erect, manly form, his beautiful and expressive countenance, his ease, and grace and dignity of manners, his kind, tender and willing address. They will remember how, by his meekness, gentleness and love, he adorned the gospel of Jesus. During his pilgrimage to the East, he appeared to have gained new and enlarged views of the fulness, the suffering and the preciousness of Christ. How mysterious that Providence which so early removes one, so well fitted to publish the unsearchable riches of Christ!"

Few men have lived who had the power to attach more strongly, or to bind more tenderly to his own, the hearts of warm and loving friends. He was cherished and greatly beloved wherever he was known. The little children, whom he loved, clustered around him. He interested himself in all that interested them; he met them in all their pursuits as one who could sympathize with them. He was the light of the household, the charm of the social circle; his presence every where, was like sunshine, and his words were a benediction. The young gave him their confidence. He had a kind, tender, generous heart, void of all selfishness and alive to all benevolent impulses, running over in spontaneous and abundant love for others, delighting in making and seeing others happy. He was genial in his disposition, frank, cheerful, and cordial. He was distinguished by his purity of character, his love of truth, and a high sense of honor. His ideas of propriety and self-respect, were only surpassed by his deep sense of moral responsibility. Most prominent among the excellencies he possessed, was his devotion to principle, a rigid conscientiousness, an unswerving integrity, that no consideration of expediency or policy could divert from the straight line of duty. No one ever charged him with insincerity, or suspected him of any sinister motive, or any disingenuous dealing, or apprehended at his hands the slightest injustice. In him there was no guile. His heart was as simple, as confiding and as transparent as childhood. We have vainly sought in his life the traces of unkindness towards a human being. There is no evidence of exasperated feeling, permanent or transient. No man living was more

free from malice, from every form of ill-will, and so abounding in whatever was true and just and lovely and of good report.

His piety was of the most simple character. He attempted no exhibitions of superior goodness. He used no cant expressions. He never, by tone, language, or gesture, expressed an emotion which he did not feel. His love for the Saviour was earnest. It permeated his whole character. It controlled all his conduct. Although he was often oppressed by a keen sense of his unworthiness; and a distrust of his own spiritual fitness for the great work to which he had consecrated himself was, probably, the heaviest weight that pressed upon his heart, yet, living or dying, he felt that he was Christ's. His faith in him as his atoning Saviour, and in God, as his reconciled Father, solaced him through life, and comforted him in his last moments. He may have had his imperfections, and failed in many things; "How frequently," he himself says, "on account of repeated failures, have I almost despaired of ever becoming a truly consistent follower of Him, who searcheth the hearts and trieth the reins of the children of men;" but he seemed to have made duty his standard, and Christ his model. His constant desire was to do good. His chief delight, was in his Master's work.

This same simplicity, so characteristic of his life, also marked his efforts in the pulpit. It seemed to be his aim to present the plain and unadulterated teachings of God's Word, with no attempt at display, with nothing boisterous or declamatory in his manner, but the simple practical truth, proceeding from an earnest heart in deep sympathy with the solemn truth which he uttered. Christ, and him crucified, was his one, great, and only theme. He was eminently a spiritual preacher. If he had lived, he would never have been an eloquent speaker, but he would have been a most valuable pastor.

The movements of his mind were calm and sedate. He had enjoyed the best advantages for mental culture. These he appreciated, and diligently improved. He was never satisfied with a mere mechanical acquaintance with a subject. In his investigations he was disposed to be thorough and accurate. His aesthetic nature was carefully cultivated. He had a love for the beautiful, a very decided taste for the Fine Arts. He was passionately fond of music, a fine amateur on the piano, violin and flute, and could perform with skill on

almost any musical instrument. He was, also, successful in the use of his pencil. In his journal are preserved many of his sketches, taken in Foreign lands, which are exceedingly creditable. If his life had been spared, he would, doubtless, have made his mark in the Church, and occupied a high position among us.

It is not surprising, that as the tidings of Mr. Kemp's death were conveyed through the land, among those who knew him, one wide lament attested the grief of all. But the loss of the Church is his gain. Whilst we mourn his early departure, his memory, fragrant with so many virtues, will long be engraven on the tablets of our hearts, and the influence of his life and example continue to be felt. His work was done, his mission, on earth, fulfilled. The Father summoned him, and he has gone to reap the eternal recompence of reward, to enjoy that rest which remaineth to the people of God. All doubts and difficulties have been removed from his mind. Many things, once enshrouded in darkness, are now all clear to him. His vision has been enlarged, his views enlightened, and he rejoices in the abode of truth and peace. We are grateful that in his exemplary life and happy death, God has given us another illustration of the blessedness and power of that religion, which can conduct us in safety through life, fortify us in every trial and conflict, relieving the mind and cheering the heart, and minister to our comfort in the last conflict.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### AT WHAT AGE SHOULD THE YOUNG BE CONFIRMED?

By Prof. H. HARBAUGH, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.

As the catechumenate looks backward to baptism, in which sacrament it has its ground and beginning, so it looks forward to confirmation, which confirmation itself admits to the Lord's Supper in which the catechumenate reaches its end and fulfilment. It becomes, therefore, an important practical question, at what age the catechumen ought to be admitted to confirmation and the Holy Supper.

On this point the New Testament gives no direct and positive direction. We learn from it, only in a general way, that both confirmation and admission to the Lord's Supper come *after* baptism, Acts 2 : 41, 42; Heb. 6 : 2. As in the Apostolic Church, the "laying on of hands," or confirmation, followed immediately on baptism, or soon after, Acts 8 : 13—17. So in the ancient Church, infants were confirmed directly upon their baptism, and received the Holy Supper immediately afterwards.\* The custom of giving the holy communion to baptized infants was general, at least through the first eight centuries. Cyprian often mentions it as the common practice; and in the liturgy contained in the Apostolic Constitutions, the rubric giving the order in which the different classes shall appear to receive it, directs at what point in the service the children shall commune. It is said it was not abrogated in France until the twelfth century, and that it continued even a little longer in Germany. Zwingle, also, speaks of the practice as continuing long among the Swiss. In the Greek Church the practice continued still longer, and was still in vogue in the last century. Infant communion in the Latin Church was abolished by the Council of Trent, on the ground that "little children who lack the use of reason, are not by any necessity obliged to the sacramental communion of the Eucharist."<sup>†</sup>

In regard to this practice it may be said that, all things being considered, it would seem to be requisite that those partaking of the Holy Supper, ought to be able to do it "in remembrance" of Christ, and to "discern the Lord's body," which can not be predicated of very young infants. Further, it is found that in the Old Testament ceremony, though infants were admitted into the covenant by circumcision, they were not admitted to the Passover—with which the Holy Eucharist corresponds—till they were old enough to ask the parents the meaning of the mystery, Ex. 12 : 26.

From these data we may conclude that some degree of self-conscious development, and consequent power of apprehending the mystery, ought to precede participation in this sacrament. But we may, also, safely take these data as showing, in the strongest possible manner, how deeply the

\* See Bingham's *Christ. Antiq.*, Vol. I, pp. 544, 535, where the authorities are given.

† Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. Session 21. Chap. 4. See, also, Bingham's *Christ. Antiq.*, Vol. II, p. 797—800.

Church felt that there should be no unnecessary delay in admitting the young into the full communion of the Church ; a feeling which it is evident the Church does not at the present day generally and sufficiently possess or appreciate. It is disposed rather to undue delay, than to undue haste ; a tendency which is nearer to error, and certainly more dangerous than the other.

So far as the precedent of Judaism has weight and force for the Christian Church, it is evidently favorable to the earliest possible period of personal responsibility, and capacity of full self-conscious moral acts. It is worth our while to look somewhat more closely into this matter of Jewish precedent, and study its bearings upon Christian practice.

As Christ is the light which illuminates Judaism, and unfolds its true meaning, we may expect to find in his life a key to its true sense, in relation to the point in hand. His twelfth year has a deep significance in his life, and serves also, to explain a similar significance attached to this period of life in Judaism. What is mentioned as transpiring in regard to himself, when he was twelve years of age, must be regarded as only the more significant and instructive, when we remember that this is the only event of his life mentioned between the time of his return from Egypt—when he was probably about five years of age—and his entering upon the public duties of his mission, in his thirtieth year.

During his infancy, "His parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the Passover ;" but it is not said that they took the "holy child, Jesus," with them. But, "when he was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem after the custom of the feast," and on this occasion took him with them.

This visit of the youthful Jesus to the Holy City, the Temple, and the Feast, has its reason in an established religious custom in the Jewish religion. At twelve years of age Jewish children were allowed to take part in the celebration of the sacred feasts. At that age the child entered upon a new degree ! They were then called "Sons of the law," because they were, from that time forward, bound to observe all the requirement of the law, and allowed to study the Mishna and Talmud. Before that time they were wholly in the family, under the care and instruction of their parents, and taught the simplest lessons of piety and obedience. But now, without being freed from the restraints of parental authority, or the duty of hearing and heeding parental instruc-

tion, they nevertheless emerged from the family into the wider and more advanced circle of the synagogue and temple service. Besides the instruction and nurture of the family, they were now also entitled to the instruction and care of the Rabbies and priests, or public teachers of the Jewish Church, and could participate in the public festivals and solemn ceremonials of the temple. This accounts for the fact that our Saviour was found "in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions." He was not out of his place; but just where his age, and the new degree of "Son of the Law," to which his age now entitled him, made it proper for him to be.

The end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth year was for Jewish children an important turning point. A solemn transition in the life took place at that time. The solemn responsibilities involved in their being, at that time, in a great measure, passed from their parents upon themselves; and the duties of the family were, in a great measure, assumed by the synagogue and the church.

It was the period when, for them, personal responsibility and personal accountability began in solemn earnest. By necessity they must now be gently pushed out beyond the family into the wider and more open and public spheres of life, to enter upon their own personal mission, to work out for themselves and for God, the solemn problems of personal responsibilities to themselves, to others to the Church and to God.

That this kind of personal accountability connected itself with that age appears in various Jewish customs. In regard to the reception of proselytes, or converts from paganism, the rule among the Jews was that: "Boys under twelve years of age, and girls under thirteen, could not become proselytes, till they had obtained the consent of their parents," and in case of a refusal on the part of their parents the consent of the officers had to be obtained.\* This shows that previous to their twelfth year their accountability was still recognized as vested in their parents; but after that period it rested in themselves.

If a proselyte had any one in his family and under his control as servants, he could require them to be circumcised or baptized before they were thirteen years old; on his own re-

\* Calmet, Art. Proselytes.

sponsibility, not asking their consent; but those who had attained that age he could not compel; but if they were obstinate, and would not embrace the Jewish religion with him, he could put them away from his family and thus relieve himself of all responsibility in regard to them.

Each of them by means of circumcision (boys) or baptism (girls) "received, as it were, a new birth; so that those who were their parents before, were no longer regarded as such after this ceremony; and those who before were slaves, now became free." Thus they passed from the relations of the family into the relations of the Church—born a second time—born from the family into the Church—born not by the act of the parent, but by the act of the Church—born by an ordinance or sacrament of the Church into its own holy family and fellowship.

It appears that the transition spoken of, was located—no doubt according to circumstances—at any time during the thirteenth year. As instruction suited to the case was associated with it, the full transition included, perhaps in most of cases, the whole year. "At the beginning of the fourteenth year, they were capable of choosing their own tutors, and of acting legally, in the disposal of property." As this was an important season, it was usually attended with the following formalities: "The father called in ten men of respectability, told them the age and proficiency of his son, and his anxious desire to be henceforth freed from all responsibility. He then, in their presence, and that of his son, offered up a prayer to God, expressive of his thanks that he was freed from the burden of his son's education, and his earnest desire that his son might reach a good old age, full of faith and good works."\*

All this shows what a solemn period this was in the life of a Jewish child; and how the responsibility and accountability of the parent, at this age, was rested upon the child's own mind and heart. How it emerged from the family bosom, turning its face toward the Jewish nation and Church, in both which it now began to act a personally responsible part.

At this age Jesus went the first time to Jerusalem, was lost in the Holy City from his parents, and found among the doctors, receiving lessons of life from their lips! How significant is all this! How beautifully does it indicate the fulfilment in himself of what has been shown to have been

\* Brown's *Antiq.*, Vol. II, p. 167.

religious custom and ordinance in the bosom of Judaism. The family lost him, the temple found him. He drops away, for a while, from the circle and care of his parents, and is found among the venerable and learned public and official representatives of the Jewish religion and Church.

There were several things which worked together to awaken, in a marked degree, the sense of personal accountability in Jewish youth at this age of transition in their life.

They were in childhood instructed in the fact that this was a turning point in their life. Their constant treatment reminded them of it. Thus, the children, of both sexes, were required, up to the age of thirteen, to have their heads covered—a token of subjection. From that age forward, boys could uncover their heads, but were required to keep their feet covered—while the girls had still to have their heads covered.\* Thus their covered heads were to them a constant daily token of the fact that they were under family care and restraints, and indirectly reminded them, also, of the time when this badge of entire subjection to other wills should be exchanged. When we remember how naturally the youthful mind looks forward to its self-responsible age, and, being unacquainted as yet with its dangers and cares, how eagerly it desires its approach, we may be assured that Jewish children had this period of coming life distinctly fixed in their minds, as a time of interesting transition.

Then, too, it was the time when they should be allowed to take part in the public festivals of the religion of their fathers. There was about the temple services and great festive assemblies of the Jews, a holy charm—a half-poetic character, highly attractive to the glowing imaginations, and buoyant spirits of youth. To be permitted, for the first time, to join the festival caravans that poured forth from the valleys of the Holy Land; to go with the tribes to the Holy City; to see, for the first time, that goodly city, and its glorious temple; to mingle, for the first time, in the jubilations of the great occasion of Israel's highest joy; this, we may well suppose, was the golden dream of Jewish children through all the slowly moving days and years of impatient childhood. And all this awaited them at the end of the twelfth year!

Then there was something in the privileges to which the occasion and the time opened up to them, well calculated to awaken in them the sense of personal accountability. With

\* Brown's *Antiq.*, Vol. II, p. 166.

proper instruction and training preceding, they were now old and mature enough to understand so much, at least, of their relations and duties to God and man, as would beget in them a strong sense of personal accountability. This would be vastly, and in a great measure suddenly, increased by their being brought into immediate and personal contact with the public worship of their religion, and their personal participation in its exercises and privileges. Seeing with their own eyes, hearing with their own ears, feeling with their hearts, and comprehending with their own minds, more clearly and fully the nature and impressiveness of those solemn acts of worship, in regard to which they previously had only incipient instructions from the lips of their parents, would awaken their religious consciousness with great facility and power. What had before grown in silence, and slowly, towards this end, would now, at once, break out into its bloom and beauty, like a flower in its season.

Have we not an illustration of this in the case of our Saviour himself, as connected with his first visit to the Holy City when he was twelve years of age? During his stay in Jerusalem, and his conversation with the doctors, he had evidently made a discovery in regard to himself which he had not learned from his parents. When his parents had returned seeking him, they gently called him to account in regard to his tarrying behind. His answer was: "How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" "My Father"—he had obtained a strong consciousness of his relation to his heavenly Father. "That I must be about my Father's *business*"—here is revealed a strong sense of his personal mission. Personal responsibility and personal accountability dawned on him as never before. His whole answer to his parents reveals in him a sense of transition from the earlier narrower limitations of the family into the open mission of life. His sense of responsibility had now outgrown its exclusive relation to his earthly parents, and sought to know and to meet its accountability to the heavenly Father, and the mission lying before it. That this was an original, or new discovery of accountability, which he had not known under the tutorage of his parents, but now first acquired in the temple, is evident from the fact that it is said of his parents in reference to his reply: "They understood not the saying which he spake unto them." Though he returned with his parents to their home in Nazareth, "and was subject unto them," as before, yet his life

had made a transition, and the sense of his mission had been lodged in his mind and wrought there as never before. When he is twelve years old, he recognizes\* God as his Father, and feels the urgent impulse of personal accountability, and is anxious to be about his Father's business.

Now, shall not these remarkable facts as elicited from Judaism, be instructive to us? Shall not this habit of the ancient typical religion in marking the period of personal responsibility and public concern and interest in religion, be of significance to Christianity; especially as it is thus recognized and confirmed by a remarkable fact in the youthful life of our Saviour! Shall it not indicate to us, that that is a period in the life of our children, full of momentous and solemn interest to them—a period when the previous training and nurture of the family should be met and assumed by the Church, to be sealed, carried forward, and completed in her wider, warmer bosom, and by her greater and better grace? Shall it not indicate that as the period when the earthly mother shall hand over the child to the spiritual mother, the Church, which is the true Jerusalem from above, and the true mother of us all? Is not this the time when the earthly father shall formally give over his child to the heavenly Father—when the earthly family shall surrender its members that they may become members of the family in Christ Jesus? Is not this the time when the child shall be taken to the temple; when it shall be lost, as it were, to its parents, but be found sitting among the pastors or teachers of the Church, hearing them and asking them questions—being catechised? Is not this the time when children should discover, from such instructions, for themselves, their personal conscious relation to their heavenly Father, and feel that, as personally accountable beings, they must be about their heavenly Father's business?

So it has evidently been regarded. Hence at an early period of the Church children that had been baptized became catechumens at an early age. Bingham says, in general terms: "As for the children of believing parents, it is certain, that as they were baptized in infancy, so they were admitted catechumens as soon as they were capable of learning."† Calvin says, also in general terms, that "It was an ancient custom in the Church for the children of Christians" to receive Confirmation "after they were come to the years of discretion." Afterwards he defines the time more nearly by

\* Olshauser's Com., Vol. II, 252. † Vol. I, p. 431.

saying it was "at the close of childhood, or the commencement of adolescence."

All these notices as to the time of their Confirmation, point plainly to the same age when among the Jews they became "Sons of the Law"—twelve to thirteen.

This same custom as to the time when children became catechumens, and the time of their confirmation, and full union with the Church, was pursued by the Reformation Churches from the beginning. "The earliest age at which confirmation was administered in the Evangelical Church was from the beginning, from twelve to fourteen years."\* This has been, and is still, as is well known, regarded as the proper age for Confirmation in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches of Germany. It was also universally practiced at an earlier period, in the Reformed, as well as Lutheran Churches, of our own land. In later years, under the false idea that a more excellent way had been discovered, parents and children have been encouraged to defer this solemnity to a later age.

We have now seen that sacred Jewish customs, illustrated by a significant fact in our Saviour's youthful life, and confirmed by the practice of the Christian Church through venerable ages, agree and combine in indicating the age of twelve or thirteen years, as the age of full personal accountability in regard to a personal profession of religion, when each one ought to assume the vows previously made, and the responsibility previously borne by Christian parents. If what evidence we have drawn from these considerations should still seem to any one to fall short of an authoritative and positive teaching, the view which is at least strongly implied in the facts presented, may be confirmed by yet other considerations.

It may be shown that the wisdom of the practice is established and confirmed by the peculiar needs of the young before, and connected with, that age, as well as, on the one hand the good effects which attend the practice, and on the other hand, the evil consequences which follow when it is neglected or set aside.

It is plain that children, before the age of twelve, are capable of receiving, and of being benefited by religious instruction. It is also plain, that however necessary and valuable that instruction is which they receive in the family,

\* Herzog Ency., Vol. III, p. 114.

it is not always—perhaps not often even—all they need. It is not to be denied that in some cases even the disposition to give it is not wanting. In other cases the capacity to give it, as it ought to be done, is not at hand; and in still other cases, owing to necessary temporal cares, the necessary time is not found to be at command.

The deficiency, it is true, is met, to some extent, by the institution of Sunday Schools. But even in these useful nurseries the teacher is not always better qualified for the solemn work, than the parent himself; and even when nothing is wanting in the qualifications of teachers, the course of instruction in a promiscuous school cannot always be made sufficiently systematic, careful, and complete, to meet all the requirements of the case.

However useful a well regulated and well conducted Sunday School may be, it must be evident to a reflecting mind, taking an intelligent view of all the high and solemn interests involved, that the Church cannot discharge all her duties toward her baptized children through its sole instrumentality. In the earlier days of the Church, when the Day-School was connected with the congregation, and the teacher was in the habit of daily catechising, and of imparting daily religious instruction, this was not regarded as sufficient to meet the wants of the case. Catechising, both by elders and pastors, was superadded.

The pastor ought to have some opportunity to instruct in a regular way the baptized children of his flock. If he has not, how shall he fulfil the injunction given to pastors alone, and repeated with double solemnity: "Feed my lambs?" How better can this be done than, after the mind and manner of the Church of all ages, to admit them early to the catechumenate, and there to train their young minds and hearts with a direct reference to their confirmation at the close of the period of their childhood, which, as Calvin says, was the custom of the Church from early times, and which custom the Reformation Churches followed.

The fresh activity of the memory which belongs to the last years of childhood, points out that as the period specially adapted to the catechumenate. With the transition to early youth the capacity for memorizing decreases. There are two reasons for this: First, by a law of the mental nature memory becomes less ready, vigorous, and tenacious as the judgment ripens; no doubt, because the mind, becoming more self-reliant with the maturing of the judgment, leans and de-

pends more on its own thinking, and, consequently, less on what it can remember from other sources. A second reason is to be sought in the fact, that the opening of youth opens up also, at the same time, numerous avenues through which diverting influences gain access to the mind, filling it with cross-currents, and thus enfeebling its powers of concentration. Whatever may be the cause or causes, the fact is well known, and confirmed to every one by his own personal experience. Previous to the time indicated, the memory acts with great singleness, and shows a wonderful power of acquiring and retaining. This is the accepted seed-time of grace, when the soil of hearts is mellow, and opens with beautiful spontaneity to receive the seed of the word that is sown upon it.

Not only is the memory at this age thus susceptible to the good seed, but in the absence of sowing, just as open to the seed of destructive tares. If not otherwise directed and employed, with what astonishing readiness and avidity does the memory of childhood take in and retain all kinds of low and useless formularies. Where the Commandments ought to be stored in the memory, lie all kinds of enigmas, puns, and puzzles. Where the creeds ought to lie housed in the mind, you will find stories of giant-killers and all that tribe of emptiness. Where you ought to find lodged the Angelic Hymn, the *Te Deum*, or other classic Hymns, you will find a perfect storehouse of doggerel songs and sentimental poetry. We may sleep, while the minds of our children lie as an open field of susceptible soil, but the enemy will not fail to sow his tares. Nor once sown, can they be rooted out. Though some good seed may be sown-later, both will grow together till the great harvest; and ever will the tares, first sown, assert their unholy advantage to the abiding injury of the good seed, which contends in painful conflict on the same soil.

We know full well, that in later times, a tendency exists, under the influence of a supposed new and better wisdom, to set aside and deprecate the old custom of committing religious formularies to memory. Memory has been regarded as the lower, and judgment as the higher, faculty; against which we have no objection to make. But this being so, it is also true that memory is the faculty that is first active; and even though partly superseded by the developed judgment, it is still important—yea, indispensable—that the memory should furnish the material on which the later judgment is to act, and which it is to use in its own proper work.

It has been contended, especially, that children should not commit to memory what they have not first clearly understood. But this is just as false as to say that we ought not to eat what we have not first digested. We eat, that we may digest, and so we store the memory that the riper judgment may have whereon to nourish and strengthen itself—and especially that faith and in the life of which alone judgment can come to right and true decisions.

It must be borne in mind, also, that the facts and objects of religious faith are necessarily, in their very nature, mysteries to be received, not first by knowledge, but by faith. They are first to be believed, and then to be learned and understood, more and more; whilst the highest powers of judgment, and the last attainments of the understanding can never fully exhaust them. Christianity has its mysteries. It is "like a tree whose roots and crown reach into the unfathomable depths and heights of eternity."

It is these very mysteries, lodged in the memory, and held and cherished in connection with the sacred associations of religious worship, which are the seeds of life, having power to gather up and hold in pious vigor the deepest and loveliest religious instincts of the soul, and to cultivate a spirit of reverence and devotion. These remembered truths, with the influence they exert on mind and heart, become thus the strongest safeguards against unbelief, apostacy, and sin. Blessed is he who has his quiver well stored with these arrows of defence against evil and danger.

"A kind God," says one, "has herein shown his wisdom and love, that he has made the memory a granary, in which seed grains for the future are laid up and preserved." They are there to grow whenever the proper conditions and surroundings shall be brought to bear on them. The ignorant man may regard these seeds as a dead and useless deposit, but the wise know that at the right time they will certainly put forth and unfold the powers of life which are in them. Let any passage be lodged in the memory; as, for instance, "Call upon me in the day of trouble," and it may lay dormant for years; but the actual coming of trouble on the soul will immediately call it up, and apply it to its legitimate purposes of consolation.

Though seed be buried long in dust,  
It shan't deceive our hope;

The precious seed can ne'er be lost,  
For grace insures the crop.'

"During the seven plenteous years, Joseph gathered and laid up for the seven years of famine to come; when the evil time has once come, and want presses, it is too late to gather."

Not only in the one particular of the memory, but in general, the period to which we refer finds the entire being in its most plastic, pliable, and impressible state. Earlier in childhood there is not sufficient earnestness of life to take abiding impressions; hence so little of early childhood; and later, diverting influences also set in too strongly. It would be an oversight, which would do much to call in question the divine source of Christianity, did it not make provision to take earnest advantage of this interesting and promising period in the life of childhood.

Moreover, this impressible state of the mind and heart, is the more hopeful, since it is precisely at that period when the Holy Spirit puts forth his silent, but most decisive and effective activities in the hearts of baptized children.

The Holy Spirit sustains a different subjective relation to the baptized from what he does to the unbaptized child. If not, what is the use of baptism? But as Paul could say to the unbelieving spirit that asked, "What profit is there in circumcision?" "Much, every way;" so, much more, can we answer in regard to the still greater grace of baptism.

The Holy Scriptures warrant the belief, and every watchful parent and pastor knows it to be true, that there are in those who have been baptized, stronger and more wakeful religious instincts; a better redeemability; a nature or basis more susceptible to the call and approach of grace; stronger, more regular, and more decisive spiritual motions, than are found in the unbaptized. There is in them that to which St. John refers, when he says, "His seed remaineth in them"—the seed which will respond to the presence of the conditions of grace, as naturally and surely as latent seed, unseen and silent in the bosom of the soil, will answer, by motions of life and signs of growth, to the warm spring sun beaming on it, and the genial breath of the South playing over it.

We have frequently found in the case of the unbaptized, even when they have been exercised by strong inclinations towards religion, a strange, almost hopeless and fatal inability to accept the vocation and offers of grace; a feebleness in laying hold by faith on the warrants of the gospel; to

them, an enigmatical indecision and powerlessness of will to commit and surrender themselves to a full and final obedience to the faith and call of the gospel, even though their own judgment and intelligent convictions strongly urged them in that direction. That which they sought, and would fain have laid hold of and embraced, floated before them, near them, around them, like an unsubstantial intangible spectre—inviting, but, at the same time, ever mocking and eluding their embrace, like the shadows that come and go in dreams, but which there is no power to appropriate and possess. A mysterious semi-transparent veil seems to reveal, but at the same time, also, to conceal the objects of faith, behind which they observe as obscure mist-images what, like St. John, they would fain hear, and see, and with open face look upon, and with their hands handle of the word of life. And still, and ever, after their best and most sincere endeavors, "remaineth the same veil untaken away;" and not until "they shall turn to the Lord," by obedience to the covenant of holy baptism, "shall the veil be taken away."

The absence of such disposition and susceptibility to grace in the heart of the unbaptized, and its presence in those who have received the grace of that ordinance, will not seem to us a strange and unaccountable thing when we call to mind what we are plainly taught in the Holy Scriptures, namely, that the promise connected with baptism, insures to its subjects the communication of the Holy Ghost. It is distinctly said in regard to the gift of the Holy Ghost: "Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him;" while to the covenant it is said of him, "but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you," St. John 14: 16, 17. And again it is as distinctly said to those who submit to baptism: "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost;" and it is added, that this promise is to us and to our children," Acts 2: 38, 39.

Shall we not, then, believe that the Holy Ghost is peculiarly active in the hearts of baptized children? Shall we not regard that child-piety, which so often and so beautifully manifests itself in the hearts, words, and lives of children in pious families, as the work of the Holy Spirit of all grace? His work at that period of the life of childhood is only the more effectual as he has less resistance to contend with; since there is not yet at hand in great degrees, the stern and stubborn bias of fixed habits, nor the formidable development of opposing passions. On the contrary, there is a trusting,

confiding disposition, which is readily sanctified, advanced and elevated into a gracious faith; and there are innocent longings after ideals of the true, the good, and the beautiful, which are readily sanctified by the Spirit's power, and made to centre and fasten on Christ, the one fairest among ten thousand and altogether lovely.

In the cultivation of this earliest, sweetest childhood-piety, the Holy Spirit needs, as in all other circumstances, the aid of the Word. Through this instrumentality he works. He enlightens and sanctifies through the truth. Hence, how necessary it is that just at this period the Church should do its work of instruction, and thus prepare the way of the Spirit, till in the solemn rite of confirmation and public profession, it shall, in God's stead, claim them publicly for his service, bless them in his name, confirm them in his holy covenant, and impart to them, by the laying on of hands, in larger measure, the Holy Ghost, by whose help alone they are able to fulfil their vows, by leading holy and unblamable lives, to their own full and final salvation, and the glory of his victorious grace.

May we not see from what has been said, how, in the practices of Christianity, what seems, to superficial reflection, as mere custom, having its origin in mere accident, caprice, or arbitrary decision, has, in fact, a far deeper ground, and a far better reason for its existence? This should teach us to interfere with venerable customs with modest caution, lest we be guilty of setting irreverently aside what is valuable, sacred, and good. Old customs are not necessarily foolish and superstitious. What our fathers revered and practiced, is not, just for that reason, useless and behind the age, and only worthy of being cast aside and trodden under foot of men.

There is an old family mansion. The life of the present aged occupant, itself, reaches far back with the last century; and his father and grand-father before him, occupied the same old homestead. The old man dies. Now the sacred depositories of the old mansion are thrown open to the young descendants of the family.

The burial decently over, we will suppose them taking a survey of things, and listen to their opinions as to the value and sacredness of the articles they find, inside and outside the venerable mansion. The first proposal, perhaps, is to remove the antique slab in the gable wall, that dates from the erection of the paternal mansion—for, are not its inscrip-

tions antiquated? The old knocker, with its coat of arms, must be removed to give place to a new and modern one. The ancient and solemn clock, in the corner, into whose face generations have gazed, while years and lives slowly passed away, may be sold for a trifle, which will help to buy a small Yankee clock for the mantle. At length they come to examine the drawers of the old secretary. There, among other things, they find an old sword, which is of no account *now*, though a brave ancestor carried it victoriously in the War for Freedom—it is cast away as old iron! Here are old parchments, of what use are they? though they are the commissions of ancestral military officers. They go among the worthless paper. So the work of Vandalism goes on, till the old mansion is cleared of everything, once sacred in the eyes of ancestors, and long preserved by careful hands; and now at length the venerable homestead is modernized to the delight of—Vandals!

This is a parable which has its fulfilment in too many instances, in the sphere of the Church. Old customs and practices are swept away with ready hands; and the work is the more easily accomplished, as those who attend to it are without any earnest sense of the true ground on which they rest, or the precious legacy they bear, and which wise men gone, would fain have transmitted; but they have, unfortunately, fallen into the ungrateful and irreverent hands of those who know how neither to receive nor to use them. A better day will return to the Church, when this miserable spirit of flippancy shall be exorcised, and when, in place of it, shall be restored the reverent spirit of the Fifth Commandment.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### THE LOST BOOKS MENTIONED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By JAMES MACFARLANE, A. M., Towanda, Pa.

THE Bible is like the world. The historical books are the great towns and cities, filled with population, life and motion. The Psalms, and other poetical books, are the landscapes, which charm the eye, excite the imagination and warm the heart. Some of the books, like Ruth and Esther,

from their slight attachment to the other Scriptures, have the appearance of islands. The prophecies are the vast, mysterious, and unfathomable oceans, which we know in part only, but whose depths will be understood when "the first heaven and the first earth are passed away, and there is no more sea," Rev. 21 : 1. The gospels must be the very gardens which the Lord God planted eastward in Eden, while Jesus is the Sun over all, the great source of light, heat, vegetation, and every blessing. The Epistles are like the veins of valuable minerals and beds of precious stones, whose treasures are unseen or unheeded by the unconverted, but in which faith enables the Christian to discover and open inexhaustible mines of gospel doctrines, of which their principal writer exclaims: "O, the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God: how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out," Rom. 11 : 33. And as there are parts of the world which are unexplored, it may not be carrying the analogy too far to compare the books mentioned in the Old Testament—but which are not now extant—to supposed submerged continents, or undiscovered parts of the globe.

Every reader of the Scriptures must have noticed references to books which are not found in the Bible, and it is natural to inquire, how many such books were there? By whom and when were they written? What were their subjects? Were they in prose or poetry? Were they merely human compositions, and their loss a matter of regret, only in a literary point of view? Or were they inspired writings? And this suggests the grave inquiry: Is the Bible incomplete, and have parts of the Holy Scripture really been lost? We propose to answer these questions by presenting the Scripture proofs of the existence of the books in question, with some extracts from some of them, quoted in the Bible, and our opinions as to their nature, value and contents. Let us begin with a catalogue of the Lost Books.

1. The Book of the Wars of the Lord.
2. The Book of Jasher.
3. The Book of Samuel concerning the kingdom.
4. The Books written by Solomon.
5. The Chronicles of David.
6. The Acts of Solomon.
7. The Book of Nathan, the Prophet.
8. The Book of Samuel, the Seer.
9. The Book of Gad, the Seer.
10. The Prophecy of Abijah, the Shilomite.
11. The Visions of Iddo, the Seer.
12. The Book of Shemaiah, the Prophet.
13. The Book of Jehu.
14. The Sayings of the Seers.

1. We read in Num. 21 : 14, 15 : "Wherefore it is said in the Book of the Wars of the Lord, what he did in the Red Sea and in the brooks of Amon, and at the stream of the brooks that goeth down to the dwellings of Ar, and lieth (or leaneth) upon the border of Moab." Here is a plain mention made of a book older than Numbers, containing an account of the same events, and a verbal quotation is given from it, of a somewhat poetical character. But we have an earlier account of a record being made, probably in the same book, of the Wars of the Lord, in Ex. 17 : 14 : "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial, in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua," &c. This is the first mention made in the Scriptures of writing, although there is little doubt the art existed before the time of Joseph. The event to be recorded was a fit subject for such "a memorial in a book," being the miraculous defeat of Amelek, when Aaron and Hur stayed up the hands of Moses till the going down of the sun, Ex. 17 : 8—16. It is evident that Moses, by the command of God, kept a journal of the military events of his time, and this book may have been more voluminous than the present Scripture accounts of the same events. Compared with modern writings, they might be called the official reports of the Commander-in-chief of the Army of Israel; and they were more properly the materials for history, than history itself. They may also have been intended as General Orders to Joshua, the commander in the field, and who was to be the successor of Moses. They were not the authorities relied on by the writers of Numbers, nor are they quoted as such, and their preservation till our day was not necessary, because the same writer afterwards prepared, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, a history of the same events, in the Pentateuch, in which many of the most important are related more than once, and all of them recorded for the instruction of the world, in all time, with as much minuteness as was consistent with the great design of the Scriptures. We have, in like manner, Julius Cæsar's Commentaries, but of what value to us would be his first rough draft of his books, or the hasty diary which he may have made, while on the campaign, and which were merged in his finished works.

2. The Book of Jasher is twice mentioned and two extracts from it given, one of them of some length, and both of them of great literary merit, Jos. 10 : 12, 13, 14. "Then spake Joshua to the Lord, in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said

in the sight of Israel, Sun stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou Moon in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still and the moon stayed until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the Book of Jasher. So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down, about a whole day. And there was no day like that, before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man: for the Lord fought for Israel."

The reader can determine for himself the disputed point, how much of the foregoing is quoted from the Book of Jasher; whether only the latter part of the 13th verse, or, from the similarity of the style, the whole passage. In either case, it is certain that there was a Hebrew poet named Jasher, who selected this wonderful event as the subject of his muse, or a book of poems called the Book of Jasher; that is, the book of the upright, or a book of songs in praise of good men. It has been conjectured that the curse on him who shall rebuild Jericho, Jos. 6:26, is also taken from this book, but for this there seems no other reason than its poetical character.

The other passage is in 2 Sam. 1:18: ("Also he bade them teach the children of Judah the use of the bow: behold it is written in the Book of Jasher.") As the people of Judah fully understood the use of the bow at this time, 1 Sam. 31:3, the bow here spoken of was, no doubt, some musical instrument, to which the following poem was to be sung; or, more probably, this was the title of the poem itself, in honor of the bow of Jonathan mentioned in it. He bade them teach the children of Judah, *The Bow*, or the following song.\* Commentators have exhausted all their elo-

\* *The Bow of Jonathan*, 2 Sam. 1:19-27. The beauty of Israel is slain upon the high places: how are the mighty fallen! Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon; lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph. Ye mountains of Gilboa let there be no dew, neither let there be rain upon you, nor fields of offerings; for there the shield of the mighty is vilely cast away; the shield of Saul, as though he had not been anointed with oil. From the blood of the slain, from the fat of the mighty, the bow of Jonathan turned not back, and the sword of Saul returned not empty. Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant in their lives, and in their death they were not divided: they were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions. Ye daughters of Israel weep over Saul, who clothed you in scarlet, with other delights: who put on ornaments of gold upon your apparel. How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle: O, Jonathan, thou wast slain in thine

quence in praise of the beauties of this elegy on the death of Saul and Jonathan, and have formed many conjectures about the passage. Its merits are evident to the person of the least poetical taste. But it has been well observed that it contains nothing relating to religion. Although written by David, (verse 17,) for aught that it contains in reference to God, or a future world, it might have been written by a Homer or a Horace, or by some one of our modern English or American poets, many of whom seem so carefully to avoid any thing spiritual in their works. This beautiful poem, we are told, was written in the Book of Jasher, whence it was transcribed in the book of Samuel. What is said to be written in that book, in Jos. 10 : 13, being also a fragment of a historical poem, we conclude that the book was a collection of state poems, songs and elegies, not given by inspiration of God, but mere human compositions. Had they been of divine origin, they would have been preserved with the Book of Psalms. The Book of Jasher was a collection of common poems, and, therefore, is long since lost. That an inspired historian should quote from an uninspired poem of David, descriptive of the events he is relating, need not be wondered at, since St. Paul, in his sermon at Athens, (Acts 17 : 28,) illustrated his subject by a quotation from one written by a heathen : "As certain also of your own poets have said," &c. See, also, Titus 1 : 12, for a similar quotation.

3. The next Book is of a political character, 1 Sam. 10 : 25 : "Then Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book and laid it up before the Lord." The government under Saul was to be a limited or constitutional monarchy, and this Book of Samuel concerning the kingdom, was the constitution of the state, defining the prerogatives of the king and the privileges of the people. An examination of the historical parts of the Old Testament would easily enable us to fill up the outline of the manner of the kingdom. The king was to be the head of the Church, or high priest, but not to act as a priest, 2 Chron. 26 : 16. He was to be the general and supreme judge, to hear appeals from inferior magistrates appointed by him. He was the executive officer, but the laws being given by God himself,

high places. I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan : very pleasant hast thou been unto me : thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women. How are the mighty fallen and the weapons of war perished.

he had no legislative power. The royal revenues and various other matters, were, no doubt, also regulated in this book of the kingdom, as well as the power of the heads of the tribes and other details of the patriarchal government. There were princes, royal scribes, recorders, and counsellors, prophets, genealogists, officers, judges, and heads of families, whose rights and duties were, no doubt, defined. So much of the Jewish history, or their laws and ceremonies, as are typical of Christ, or in any way related to the history of the Church, or the great work of redemption, is always given in detail in the Bible. But the mere political regulations, contained in Samuel's books of the manner of the kingdom, are not preserved, because they were not profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, 2 Tim. 3 : 16.

4. As Solomon's kingdom excelled all others in other respects, so, also, he was the greatest and most celebrated author on various subjects, both in prose and poetry. 1 Kings 4 : 32, 33 : "And he spake three thousand proverbs, and his songs were a thousand and five. And he spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hysop, that springeth out of the wall. He spake also of beasts and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes. Here is a very condensed catalogue of a very large library of the literary works of Solomon, in addition to his inspired writings, which are not here mentioned, unless the book of Proverbs is a part of the three thousand, and the Song of Solomon one of the one thousand and five. We may repine at the ways of Providence, and indulge in useless regrets that Solomon's books are lost, but the almost miraculous providences which have preserved, in its purity, to us, the Word of God, are not to be exercised for works like these. They were but things of a day. As well might we regret that we are not permitted to see Solomon's royal robes, or the smoke of the sacrifices that arose from his altars.

5. We are told 1 Chron. 27 : 24, that Joab began to number the people, but he finished not, because there fell wrath for it against Israel; neither was the number put in the account of the Chronicles of King David. The Chronicles here spoken of, were merely the authentic records of the government; and these statistical returns of the census, which Joab abandoned in disgust, and David suppressed with shame, (the taking it being an act of disobedience,) were not recorded among the archives of the kingdom. Doubtless, in the time of David,

a very large quantity of documents had been accumulated, belonging to civil affairs, which had no relation whatever to the sacred Scriptures.

6. The same remarks, as well as some of those preceding, will apply to a book called the *Acts of Solomon*, 1 King 2: 41: "And the rest of the acts of Solomon, and all that he did, and his wisdom, are they not written in the book of the *Acts of Solomon*?" The details of the whole life of so great and remarkable a prince as Solomon, were no doubt written at length, and carefully preserved for a long time under his successors. So great an author would not be without a biographer. We have in the Scriptures a better life of him, written by an infallible hand, and containing all that it is important for us to know. The other eight books may be considered together.

7, 8 and 9. The Books of Nathan, Samuel, the Seer, and Gad, the Seer, are all mentioned in 1 Chron. 29: 29. "Now the acts of David, the King, first and last, behold they are written in the Book of Samuel, the Seer, and in the Book of Nathan, the Prophet, and in the Book of Gad, the Seer." The Book of Nathan, the Prophet, is also mentioned in 2 Chron. 9: 29.

10 and 11. 2 Chron. 9: 29: "Now the rest of the acts of Solomon, first and last, are they not written in the Book of Nathan, the Prophet, and in the prophecy of Abijah, the Shilomite, and in the visions of Iddo, the Seer, against Jeroboam, the son of Nebat?"

12. Iddo, the Seer, is also mentioned in 2 Chron. 12: 15: "Now the acts of Rehoboam, first and last, are they not written in the Book of Shemaiah, the Prophet, and of Iddo, the Seer, concerning genealogies."

13. 2 Chron. 20: 34: "Now the rest of the acts of Jehosaphat, first and last, behold they are written in the Book of Jehu, the son of Hanani, who is mentioned in the book of the Kings."

14. We are told in 2 Chron. 33: 19, of Menasses, "His prayer, and also how God was entreated of him, and all his sins and his trespasses, and the places, wherein he built high places, and set up groves and graven images before he was humbled: behold they are written among the sayings of the Seers." Some suppose that instead of Seers, a Prophet, named Hoai, is here meant. Gad, David's Seer, is also mentioned in 2 Sam. 24: 11.

It seems the prophets were also the historians of the

kings and people of Israel, and that they left longer and more particular accounts of public events, than those contained in the Scriptures, which are here enumerated by the writer of 2nd Chronicles, that book being a shorter history of the same period. No extracts from any of these eight books are given. We have only their titles, and the facts, that they contained other particulars of the reigns of David, Solomon, Rehoboam, Jehosaphat and Menasses, which were so unimportant that the writer of the Chronicles, omitted them entirely. A busy fancy may imagine anything in regard to their contents, or value, but we have no right to suppose they were anything more than the Scriptures say they were, namely, the less important portion of the history of those five kings of Israel, in detail, which would undoubtedly have been both uninteresting and uninstructive to us. The Old Testament history, is history with a purpose. It is the history of religion, which, in the sight of God, is the only important thing on earth, and compared with which all else is scarcely worth mentioning, and its fulness or brevity, is just in proportion as there was more or less of the work of redemption to be seen in it, or as it contained more or less of gospel mystery. The whole Bible is full of the gospel, with this difference, that in the Old Testament we see it by the feeble light of a few stars, or at times, as in David's day, by moon-light, or at other periods the night is dark, when there is "no open vision." But in the New Testament we have the broad day-light of the "Sun of righteousness."

The whole Bible should be read with a view to its main subject—the relations of man to God; our duties, our condition, and how we shall be saved. The great work of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the golden thread which runs through the whole Bible. This is the clew which should guide us through every labyrinth. "The rest of the acts, first and last," of all the kings of Israel which are not related in the Bible, contained no part of the history of redemption, and had no relation or connection with it whatever, hence they are not preserved, and they would have been useless to us if they had been.

There are also other books mentioned in the Old Testament in the same form, 1 Kings 14 : 19—29, 1 Kings 22 : 39, 2 Chron. 36 : 8, 2 Chron. 35 : 26, &c. In Jos. 18 : 9, we are told that men appointed for the purpose, "went and passed through the land and described it by cities into seven parts, in a book, and came again to Joshua, to the host at

Shilvah. Recorders and scribes are frequently mentioned in the books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles, and they no doubt wrote many volumes. In Esther 6:1, the book of records of the Chronicles is spoken of; and the Chronicles of the kings of Media and Persia, in Esther 10:2. Job 19:23, expresses the desire that his words were "printed in a book," and afterward, 31:35, that his "adversary had written a book." And Solomon, in Ec. 12:12, declared that "of making many books there is no end."

There was a literature in the Bible times, among the Israelites, independent of the Holy Scriptures. In addition to the books, incidentally mentioned or quoted in the Bible, no doubt there were great numbers of others, many of them were secular writings of men of the world, others were the uninspired works of some of the writers of parts of the Scriptures. Although some of them are referred to and quoted from, and may thus be recognized in the Bible as authentic histories, yet there is no reason to suppose they are inspired. For example, if St. John, who wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, had mentioned that event and referred to Josephus' work (if they had been written at that time) as containing further particulars, it would not follow that Josephus was an inspired writer. There is not the slightest reason for believing that any inspired writing has not been preserved. We have the whole Bible; no part of it is wanting. No real Christian can fail to make the gift of the Word of God the subject of thankfulness in his daily prayers; and his must surely be an ungrateful heart, which would imagine, without a particle of proof, that the Holy Spirit had inspired holy men of old to write parts of the Scriptures which have not been handed down to us. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul," Ps. 19:7. Trust in the Word of God as the all sufficient "Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith, which is in Jesus Christ, 2 Tim. 3:15; and let him who would impair our confidence in the Bible, by persuading us that it is fragmentary or incomplete, beware of the curse denounced in Rev. 22:18, 19. If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book, and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book."

## ARTICLE VIII.

## THE EVERLASTING COVENANT OF PROMISE TO DAVID.

By Rev. HENRY DANA WARD, Philadelphia.

SALVATION is from certain and endless death unto a joyous and glorious immortality. Salvation is the rescue of fallen man from this world of sin and sorrow, of trouble, sickness, and death, and the placing of him in the redeemed earth, the promised-land of the righteous, through the resurrection, unto life eternal in Jesus Christ our Lord. This great salvation is set forth in the Holy Scriptures on a perfect plan, first folded in the promise of eternal life, made by him who cannot lie, before the world began, (Tit. 1 : 2,) and unfolded more and more, through every dispensation, from Adam to Christ; from the promise of the seed of the woman, made in Eden, to the promise of a Son of the Highest, made to the blessed Virgin, his resurrection from the dead, and his exaltation unto the right hand of God. A plan, intended to lead man, of his own free will, from death unto life; voluntarily to abandon sin, and to follow after righteousness; a plan to take him, not by omnipotent power, from the hand of the enemy, and to restore him to an immortality, once forfeited, and now little regarded; but to train him, in the school of this transitory life, highly to prize, and earnestly to labor for, the promised inheritance of eternal life, in the love and service of our Maker and Redeemer.

This plan has been elsewhere considered, under the three following heads: 1. The Restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." 2. "The Everlasting Covenant of Promise, made with Abraham and his *seed, which is Christ.*" 3. "The Covenant of Promise, made with Israel in Horeb, to give them the land (*aretz*) promised to their fathers, for their inheritance forever." All these are "Everlasting Covenants." They all, by faith, lay hold on the one Lord, the same Jesus Christ; the same promised land in the "better country, even an heavenly;" on the same eternal life; on the same seed of Abraham, after his faith; on the same house of Jacob

and Israel chosen, in Christ, out of all nations ; and on the same kingdom of God and restitution of all things, foretold by all the prophets, and preached in the gospel ; for which we daily pray, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done *in earth as in heaven.*"

God has given in the Scriptures many covenant promises and holy prophecies of his great salvation, all relating, when they were given, first, to the future of this transitory world, and, secondly, to the kingdom of God, and to the incorruptible inheritance of the saints, in the eternal world to come, on the new earth, under new skies. All the great promises and prophecies of the Holy Scriptures contain this two-fold promise and prospect of inheritance ; one at hand, to be received in this life, as a voucher for the other, afar off, in eternal life ; one to be realized in this world, for a guaranty of the other to be realized in the heavenly world to come : both addressed to the faith of the hearer, the one of eternity wrapped up in one of time so wisely, that the unfolding of the promise of time, enlightens the faith, and provides material of hope on which the believer can lay hold, and grasp the invisible realities of eternity, in the land of the blest.

This great law of Scripture interpretation, appears in the promise of the seed of the woman to crush the Serpent's head, before the first-born of the woman came into the world: likewise, in the birth of Ishmael, Abraham's natural seed, and the type of his seed after the flesh ; and again, in Isaac, Abraham's heir, the child of promise, and type of the true seed, *which is Christ.* The same law governs the promise to Abraham of the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, in which land he lived, while he sought the better country, even an heavenly, of which Canaan is the recognized type : "Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac, and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying : Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance," Ps. 105 : 9. The same great law is stamped on the face of the promise to Israel, at Horeb, and again at the eastern bank of the river Jordan, where, with the land of Canaan lying before them, they individually had the promise of its possession for their inheritance, as the land given their fathers, a pledge in hand for the better country afar off.

The Everlasting Covenant of Promise to David exactly follows the same great law of holy promise and prophecy, presenting to the faith of David, of Israel, and of all be-

lievers, eternal inheritances of the future resurrection life, under the symbols of blessings in this life, future at the time, the covenant promise and prophecy were announced by the mouth of the holy prophet. Wrapt under the veil of his son, Solomon, not yet begotten, and under the veil of his temporal throne in Jerusalem, and his dominion over the twelve tribes of Israel, there plainly appears JESUS, the Son of David and the Son of the Highest; Immanuel's everlasting throne in the Holy City, New Jerusalem, over the holy people, "even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles," Rom. 9 : 24; and over their incorruptible inheritance of the habitable world to come in eternal life.

The Covenant Promise was given under the following circumstances. David, having obtained peaceable possession of the kingdom of all Israel, built himself a house of cedar for a permanent residence; while the Ark of the Covenant, with the Shekinah beneath the wings of the cherubim, was yet sheltered in a tent, as it had always been from the days of Moses. "The King said unto Nathan, the prophet: See now; I dwell in a house of cedar, but the Ark of God dwelleth within curtains," 2 Sam. 7 : 2: and he vowed: "Surely, I will not come into the tabernacle of my house, nor go up into my bed; I will not give sleep to my eyes, nor slumber to my eyelids, until I find out a place for the Eternal, an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob," Ps. 132 : 2.

To this zeal for the honor and service of the Eternal, the Lord sent a reply of remembrance by the mouth of Nathan, the prophet, containing these words: "Moreover, I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and I will plant them; that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as before time. \* \* \* Also the Lord telleth thee, that he will build thee a house. And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name; and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. \* \* \* And thy house, and thy kingdom, shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever," 2 Sam. 7 : 10. David's humble acknowledgments, prayers, and praises, directly follow, accepting the promise, and soliciting its confirmation: "For thy people Is-

rael, to be a people unto thee forever; and thou Lord art become their God; and now O Lord God, the word that thou hast spoken concerning thy servant, and concerning thy servant's house, establish it forever, and do as thou hast said," 2 Sam. 7: 24.

Truly in Solomon, after David slept with his fathers, the Eternal did set up one "which shall proceed out of thy bowels," and did "establish his kingdom;" for Solomon was born after the promise was made to David, and he did build the Lord's house. This was the temporal wrapper of the eternal promise; the present and visible pledge of the remote and invisible Son of David, his temple in the heavens, and the people of God, the future Immanuel and the kingdom of heaven in the land of the blest.

It is needless to pursue this subject in connection with the temporal throne of David, further than to show the fulfilment of the promise in Solomon and his line, to the time of the revolt of the ten tribes, which gave that throne a sad shock; and to the captivity in Babylon, when that throne disappeared from among the nations. The royal family continued, but the children of Israel from that time have abode "many days without a king, and without a prince" of David's line, because his children forsook the way of the Lord, and the covenant of David their father; and, so far as concerns this world, the house of David is only established in Christ forever; for the temporal throne of David has long since disappeared. We turn from the temporal and broken casket, to study and to admire the jewels of heavenly promise and of eternal life, contained in its now open folds, revealing the future kingdom of God on the earth.

It is plain that portions of this covenant promise were fulfilled in Solomon, and in the natural Israel, and in the throne of David in this world, and in David's house; and it is equally plain, that other portions of this covenant promise were not fulfilled in Solomon, and cannot be fulfilled in the natural Israel, neither in this transitory world, by any people, or house; for those other portions are eternal. Solomon came to the throne the younger of several brothers, who, by the laws of birth, might have been preferred before him; and one of whom, Adonijah, was proclaimed king by Joab, and a great party. King David, however, displaced Adonijah, who was born to David before he received the covenant promise; and David set Solomon on his throne, who, accord-

ing to the terms of the promise, proceeded from the bowels of David subsequent to the time of giving that promise.

Solomon sent unto Hiram, king of Tyre, saying: "I purpose to build an house unto the name of the Lord my God, as the Lord spake unto David my father, saying: Thy son whom I will set upon thy throne in thy room, he shall build an house unto my name," 1 Kings 5:5. And, when that house was finished, Solomon praised the Lord before all the congregation of Israel, saying: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, which spake with his mouth unto David my father, and hath with his hand fulfilled it, saying: \* \* \* Whereas it was in thy heart to build a house unto my name, thou didst well that it was in thy heart. Nevertheless, thou shalt not build the house; but thy son that shall come forth out of thy loins, he shall build the house unto my name. And the Lord hath performed his word that he spake, and I am risen up in the room of David my father, and sit on the throne of Israel, as the Lord promised, and have built a house for the name of the Lord God of Israel, \* \* \* Therefore now, Lord God of Israel, keep with thy servant David, my father, that thou promisedst him, saying: There shall not fail thee a man in my sight, to sit on the throne of Israel; so that thy children take heed to their way, that they walk before me as thou hast walked before me. And now, O God of Israel, let thy word be verified, which thou spakest unto thy servant David, my father. But will God, indeed, dwell on the earth?" 1 Kings 8:15-27.

In all this, the fulfilment of the promise to David is assumed, and in the eyes of the casual reader this completely satisfies the promise. The considerate reader, however, observes something further intended in the promise, brought distinctly into view, when "David said to Solomon: My son, it was in my heart to build a house unto the name of the Lord, my God. But the word of the Lord came to me saying: Thou hast shed blood abundantly, and hast made great wars: thou shalt not build a house unto my name, because thou hast shed much blood upon the earth in my sight. Behold, a son shall be born to thee, who shall be a man of rest; and I will give him rest from all his enemies round about; for his name shall be Solomon, (Peace, Prosperity, Happiness,) and I will give peace and quietness unto Israel in his days. He shall build an house for my name: and he shall be my son, and I will be his father; and I will establish the throne of his kingdom over Israel forever," 2 Chron 22:7.

It is impossible that Solomon, of the flesh of David, could be the Son of God in such a sense, as to have "the throne of his kingdom established over Israel forever;" for both Solomon and his Israel were mortals, and his kingdom when established, was in this world, which, with all its kings and its kingdoms, passeth away. Indeed, the condition of the promise is: "That thy children take heed to their way; that they walk before me, as thou hast walked before me;" which condition they did not keep, and with their failure, the temporal part of the promise failed; but the eternal remains in Jesus, the Son of David, to be satisfied still.

The eternal parts of this covenant promise can never fail. They are secured by the oath of Him who said: "Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David: his seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the Sun before me: it shall be established forever, as the Moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven," Ps. 89: 35. This oath contains the eternal portion of the promise; and carries on its face, for our consideration, three things. 1. The promised seed, which shall endure forever. 2. The realm, or seat, of the promised throne. 3. The people of that realm.

1. The seed which shall endure forever, was not Solomon, who was dead and buried before this Psalm of Ethan, the Ezrahite, was written. Neither could it have been any other of the children of David's house, or time, but only one, according to the Scriptures, who is Jesus, the promised Son of David, the promised seed of Abraham, the promised seed of the woman, the acknowledged Son of God: "And lo a voice from heaven, saying: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," Matt. 3: 17. This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear him," Matt. 17: 5. Every reader assents to this self-evident proposition, which we feel constrained, nevertheless, to demonstrate by Scripture, not for the sake of the naked fact, so much as for the Scripture circumstances, gathered about this great fact, going to show, that truly as Jesus is the promised Son of David, neither his throne, nor his people, are born of the flesh, or have their inheritance *in this world* of sin; but they are born of God, on this earth, renewed for the dwelling place of the righteous in the resurrection from the dead. In the city built of God, both the Son of David and his people are to reign and dwell in peace forever. This view of the subject accords with the interpretation already given to the promise of the Apostastasis, or restitution of all things, seeing

that the restitution requires to be made of the very things lost; and to be made to the losing party, in the same place they were taken from him, viz.: life eternal, in the body, with the possession and dominion of the whole *arets*, or earth, to the righteous Son of Man, and his seed. It perfectly accords, also, with the covenant promises to Abraham and his seed, which is Christ, that his seed, with himself, shall have the *arets* for an everlasting inheritance; and accords, likewise, with the covenant promises, made to the children of Israel, in Horeb, on their way from Egypt to Canaan: a land flowing with milk and honey, given to their fathers.

In that Psalm of Ethan the Ezrahite, it is written: "I will sing of the mercies of the Lord, forever; with my mouth will I make known thy faithfulness to all generations. For I have said, Mercy shall be built up forever; thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in the very heavens. I have made a covenant with my chosen; I have sworn unto David, my servant: Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne unto all generations. \* \* Then thou spakest in vision to thy Holy One, and saidst: I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people: I have found David, my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him: with whom my hand shall be established; mine arm, also, shall strengthen him: the enemy shall not exact upon him, nor the son of wickedness afflict him. And I will beat down his foes before his face, and plague them that hate him. \* \* I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry unto me: Thou art my Father, my God, and the Rock of my salvation. Also, I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth. \* \* His seed, also, will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven," Ps. 89: 1—29.

David, the son of Jesse, having been long gathered to his fathers, when this 89th Psalm was written, its promises cannot belong to him in this world; nor can they belong to any son of David in this world; for, neither can any mortal life endure "forever," nor can any temporal throne be "as the days of heaven." We, therefore, turn, for the subject of these great promises, from David, the son of Jesse, to David the Son of God, on whom there is laid strength to bear them. Jesus, the Virgin's son, of whom it is written: "And they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us," Matt. 1: 23; the measure of whose hand

compasses the sea, and his right hand the rivers of the whole earth. That "his seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven," appeared on the day of Pentecost, by St. Peter saying: "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us to this day. Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ, to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens; but he saith himself: The Lord said unto my Lord: Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes, thy footstool. Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," Acts 2 : 29—36.

There can be no question that Jesus is the son of David, and that "he shall (on the word of the angel Gabriel) be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father, David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke 1 : 31. In him God hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of *salvation for us, in the house of his servant David*: \* \* \* to remember his holy covenant, *the oath which he sware to our father Abraham*, Luke 1 68, 73. Jesus is raised up to, perform both the covenant to David, and the covenant to Abraham, both everlasting covenants, which together lay hold on eternal life in the new earth.

The Psalms and the prophets testify to Christ's power and fitness for this office; as it is written: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness. Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with oil of gladness above thy fellows," Ps. 45 : 6; Heb. 1 : 8. "Behold, the Lord hath proclaimed unto the end of the world: Say ye to the daughter of Zion: Behold, thy salvation cometh; behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him. And they shall call them, The holy people: The Redeem-

ed of the Lord ; and thou shalt be called, Sought out, a city not forsaken," Is. 62 : 11. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given ; and the government shall be upon his shoulders, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government, and peace, there shall be no end upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth, even forever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this," Is. 9 : 6, 7.

The throne of David is no longer in this world, nor is it in the heart. His throne was in Jerusalem, over the house of Jacob ; and the King of Zion has a throne in the heavenly city, over the house of his redeemed and chosen, to come down with him from God out of heaven, and to dwell with men on the earth, not in this sinful world surely, but in the heavenly world to come, (Rev. 21,) with the restitution of all things, (Acts 3 : 19).

2. Enough has been said on the first consideration in the promise to David of "a seed that shall endure forever ; and his throne as the sun before God," to identify that seed with the son of the Virgin. We consider next, the realm, or seat, of that throne.

Man is able to reason from past experience to future expectations, but with uncertain conclusions. The Eternal claims it, and we concede it, to be his prerogative, to foretell the destiny of the nations, and of this whole world. We know comparatively nothing of the future, except it be revealed in the Scriptures. Many things of the future and unseen world, are in plain terms described in the Book ; and some things are mysteriously described ; incomprehensible to finite minds. We devoutly receive them all, having the most perfect confidence in the truth of the holy word ; and, also, that those things which we know not now, we shall know hereafter.

It is plainly revealed, that Jesus, the Son of David, is the Lord Christ. ; that he came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the Virgin Mary, by the Holy Ghost ; that he preached and taught doctrines of heavenly wisdom and of sublime morality ; that he wrought miracles such as the world had never seen ; that he was brought through envy to the painful death of the cross ; and that, on the third day, he rose again from the dead ; on the fortieth day after, he ascended into heaven, from whence he is coming to judge both

the living and the dead, in a kingdom which shall never end. These are commonly received articles of all creeds, and of all denominations of Christians, according to the Scriptures.

It is mysteriously revealed, that this same Jesus is the Word of God: "All things were made by him," "who is the image of the invisible God;" "God manifest in the flesh," "justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory," 1 Tim. 3:16. "This is the true God and eternal life," 1 John 5:20.

Mysteries are here, which, nevertheless, fall in happily with the plain things revealed. For example: That the same who came from heaven, and took our nature upon him, of the seed of Abraham, is that "Eternal life which God promised before the world began;" that, being put to death in the flesh, he was quickened by the Spirit, and, having overcome death, he ascended up to heaven, where he was before: that having a body formed of this earth, changed into a glorified body, he will leaven our earth with it, and remove the curse from the ground; that having dwelt among men, in this sinful kingdom, he will much more dwell with the righteous in the mountain of his holiness, on the new earth; that, being the promised seed of the woman, he will not only crush the Serpent's head, but cast the usurper out of his kingdom, take away his armor, spoil his house, and make all things new; that, being the seed of Abraham, to whom the *arets* is promised for an everlasting possession, he will take the possession in the dispensation of the fulness of time, and divide the inheritance among all the heirs with him; and that, being David's Son, and David's Lord, he shall sit on "the throne of his father David, and shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." He shall rule, not only over the righteous of Abraham's seed after the flesh, but over all nations, with "his hand upon the seas, and his right hand upon the rivers of the earth," in eternal life.

We are dust of the earth before him. What is man, that he should lift up his voice against the mysterious word of his Maker? Yet, this is as plain as words can make it, that the seat of David's throne is on our mother earth, and that the land of milk and honey, of vines, olives, and figs, promised for the everlasting possession of Abraham and his "seed, which is Christ," and for the inheritance of the twelve tribes of the ransomed Israel, forever, *is on this earth*; and that

the restitution of all things, includes, not only the forgiveness of sins, with justification unto the eternal life, but also includes the blissful earth, with its possession and dominion in the redeemed body, all which Adam lost. Were the word *arets*, or earth, used only as a figure, man is not at liberty to change the figure, in regard to the invisible; but it is our place to hold it fast, that through things seen and well known, we may come to the right conception of things not seen, to be enjoyed hereafter. There is a world past, a world present, and a world to come; and the contrast between this world and that to come, is as between heaven and earth: yet the world to come, the present, and the past, are all on this same earth, and not in unknown space of the fathomless heavens. And the Prince of this World being cast out of his usurped dominion, into outer darkness, where he was before, and where he belongs, will no longer keep the earth in darkness, or man out of possession, or the Son of Man out of the dominion of this earth; but with death and hell and all his caravan of servants and followers, he will be swept out of the earth forever. The intimation contained in the 20th chapter of Revelations, that he will return for a season, is one we can never take in a sense to shake our trust in the arm of the Lord, and in the throne of the Prince of Peace, and in the security of that everlasting possession, sworn alike to Abraham, to David, and to Christ and his seed, for their inheritance forever; whose "throne shall endure as the sun before me."

What saith the Scripture concerning the earth? "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." "Wait on the Lord, and inherit the earth; for such as are blessed of him shall inherit the earth, and they that are cursed of him, shall be cut off." "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." "The Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and before his ancients gloriously." "For he cometh to judge the earth."

Where, but upon earth, is Mount Zion; and where else is the house of Jacob, over which, on the Word of God, by the angel Gabriel, Jesus shall reign "forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end?" Where, but upon the earth, has the Lord God "visited and redeemed his people, Israel?" "Again, Esaias saith: There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise, to reign over the Gentiles," Rom. 15: 12.

"With righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth. And he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. \* \* \* For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea," Is. 11 : 4—9.

No one is so blind, that he cannot see all these things belong to our earth; and however figurative one may consider the letter of the word, it figures no other place, besides our earth, for the exhibition and display of this heavenly bliss of our people Israel, when "the Branch" out of Jesse shall come "to reign over the Gentiles," and with righteousness to judge the poor, and to reprove with equity for the meek of the earth."

"We admit, says one, that a happy time is coming on the earth, under the administration of the children of Abraham converted to Christ; and, it may be, with Christ himself on the throne, and the various national Churches, his dioceses, under the care of the Church in Jerusalem, encircling the globe with the fruits of righteousness, and with loud anthems of praise."

If so, the happy time must follow after the end of this dispensation, in which *faith* is the first element. For, in that dispensation, faith seems to be swallowed up in vision, if Christ be present on the throne; and, if not present, the news of that coming dispensation is no gospel to the true believer.

For, what is the gospel, but good news of the Son of David coming in his kingdom with eternal life and bliss, whose kingdom is at hand? To announce the kingdom, as coming with an empty throne, is a fraud upon the truth worthy of the father of lies. And to announce the coming kingdom with the Jews after the flesh on the judgment seat, is Anti-christ in a shape more hideous than he foretold by John. *That* liar "denieth that Jesus is the Christ;" but *this* proceeds to curse, to spit upon, and to crucify that holy and just One.

"The Jews, as a nation, are all to become converted!"  
When the Lord's prayer is satisfied, and the whole earth

becomes full of his glory, not only the Jews, but every other people, whether in heaven, or in earth, or under the earth, will make confession "that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father," Phil. 2 : 11. But our labor is now to show by the Book, that the realm of the Son of David, is not this world converted, but the whole creation restored, even the earth, including its heavens; which may be confirmed by the creeds and liturgies of all Christian ages, and by the mouth of all the holy prophets, since the world began: "For he cometh; for he cometh to judge (to reign over) *the earth*; he shall judge (reign over) the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth," Ps. 96 : 13; also Ps. 98 : 9. "O, let the nations be glad, and sing for joy; for thou shalt judge (reign over) the people righteously, and govern the nations *upon earth*. \* \* \* Then shall the earth yield her increase, and God, even our own God, shall bless us; \* \* \* and all the ends of *the earth* shall fear him," Ps. 67.

There is startling evidence to prove, that pious and holy men may repeat these holy anthems daily, and yet think of them as beautiful poetry of heaven, having no reality *in the earth*. They cast out the very name of the earth from their thoughts, as unclean; and they imagine that the earth and its increase, and its nations, are figures of speech, descriptive of a place and of a growth and of peoples, in some part, or in all parts, of the boundless universe. "To the law and to the testimony:" when these say *earth*, let us not only repeat "earth" with our lips, but believe in our heart, "earth." He that has said it will make it good; never do you fear. It is not once, nor twice, but many times over, that the Book describes the earth as the place where the God of heaven shall establish the throne of his kingdom, "that all people, nations, and languages should serve him; whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed," Dan. 7 : 14. "The Lord shall reign forever, even thy God, O Zion, unto all generations. Praise the Eternal." This Jesus is the Christ, the promised seed of David, whose realm shall be over the face of the whole earth; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.

3. The people of the king's realm are yet to be considered. "The Everlasting Covenant," in which the Eternal pledged unto David a son, thereafter to be born, whose "throne shall be established forever," together with David's house, and

David's kingdom forever, also includes the name and the condition of the happy people, in the following words:

"Moreover, I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as before time," 2 Sam. 7:10.

The name of the people, Israel, is familiar; but circumstances connected with the name in this great covenant, prove that its meaning, in this place, is peculiar and uncommon. "I will appoint a place for my people Israel." The natural Israel were then in *their* natural place, their promised land; the land of their forefathers. The holy promise, therefore, to "appoint a place for my people Israel," proves that the place they were then in, is not the one ultimately intended for them: that the Eternal had other views, than entered into the heart of the Jews, who supposed that they were already planted and dwelling in a place of their own, from which they should move no more.

It is evident, that neither the natural Israel of that day, nor of any day since, can be intended in this great covenant; for then a place need not be appointed for them, seeing they were happily in that, under the rule of their own greatest king. But the place appointed for the Israel of the Everlasting Covenant, is one in which, being once planted, they have it for "their own, and move no more." The natural Israel have always felt that the land of their forefathers is their own. In the old time of king Zedekiah, they were sure of it, and that they could never be removed out of it. A similar confidence prevailed among that people in the time of the Emperor Vespasian, and again, in the time of Hadrian. They clung to the possession of their country with a confidence in their divine rights to hold it, and never be moved, which was a remarkable compound of the ridiculous and the sublime. Yet they could not resist the will of Nebuchadnezzar, nor the power of Vespasian's legions, nor the decree of Hadrian. They were entirely cleaned out of Jerusalem, and from the very soil of Palestine. They remain so, for the most part, to this very day. *These* are not, nor can they ever be, the Israel of the covenant with David, who shall "dwell in a place of their own, and move no more."

Of Israel named in the covenant, the Eternal says, "I will appoint a place for them, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more." After having been twice, or thrice, and for many centuries, thrust

out of that land in which they dwelt, when this covenant, promising to appoint Israel a place for them, was made, it is impossible to keep the covenant by restoring some future generation to that same land from which their ancestors were expelled. If the promise to plant them, that they may dwell in their own place, and move no more, does not apply to the fathers to whom it was spoken, there is no reason to suppose it will apply to their children, after a failure of fifty successive generations: nor can the children be any more sure of the place, and of not being driven from it, than their fore-fathers were. The event, therefore, proves that the place of their planting, intended in the promise, does not belong to the geography of this world, neither to the race in the flesh.

After this manner the Bible prepares its attentive reader to understand by the name Israel, in all the prophecies relating to the fulfilment of this covenant, not the natural seed of Jacob, by any means; not Israel after the flesh, but quite another people, whose acquaintance we proceed to make, without any regret of leaving the Jews behind: for with eminent virtues, and with few of the grosser vices which defile the land, they are still a people in this world, swollen with conceit, to have Abraham for their father, and with contempt and envy at the exaltation of the Son of David, our crucified King, and of the nations that are called by his name.

Every author of distinction uses the same word, or name, in very different senses, according to its connections and relations. Israel is a name thus used by the Author of the Scriptures. It is freely used for the name of the natural seed of Jacob, and again for the house of Jacob of the resurrection. In this covenant with David, it is used in the latter sense: so by Gabriel in the annunciation to the blessed Virgin; so in the prophet Isaiah, and in all the prophets: "Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called; I am he; I am the first, I also am the last," Is. 48 : 12. You that are called, are Israel, if you obey; even of the house of Jacob, if you choose the heavenly portion for inheritance; otherwise, of the house of Esau, who, despising his birthright, was rejected, "though afterward he sought it carefully with tears." "For they are not all Israel which are of Israel; neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children," Rom. 9 : 6. "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him," Rom. 10 : 12.

Israel of the covenant with David, are the people who in-

voke the name of the Lord, whether Jew or Greek he listens to their cry. Though in time past they were not a people, now they are the people of God; "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people." Once sheep going astray, but now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of souls, 1 Pet. 2. In this manner, not only the covenant with David, but that also with Abraham, is fulfilled, saying: "Thou shalt be a father of many nations"—many in the flesh, but one in the faith; many in this world, but one in Jesus and the resurrection; many in the languages and kingdoms of time, but one in the kingdom of the promised Son of David, which shall have no end. Concerning this people, the prophet Isaiah says: "They also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the (*arets*) land forever; the branch of my planting; the work of my hands," Is. 60: 21. "And in that day will I make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground; and I will break the bow, and the sword, and the battle out of the earth, and will make them to lie down safely," Hos. 2: 18.

What can this covenant for man with the lower creation be, except it secure their return to the obedience of man in all quietness and peace? For the recovery of the dominion over creation is secured, not only in raising the dead body, and planting Israel, to move no more; but also in reviving all nature, as it is written: "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old. \* \* Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine; and all the hills shall melt; and I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them. And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land, which I have given them, saith the Lord," Amos 9: 11.

In this propheey we find a distinct recognition of the doctrine of the resurrection, in the promise to raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen; and, also, of the bounteous flow of the precious fruits of the earth, in that land which is the joy of all lands, the place the Eternal appoints for his

people ; and we have the recognition of one of the principal features of the Everlasting Covenant with David, that the Lord "will plant" his people Israel, in the land given to them, and they shall move no more, "neither shall they be pulled up out of their land." However we may be disposed to take husbandry and crops of this prophecy, for a figure of better things for the soul ; it does not seem right to convert the earth itself into a figure of some other place, any more than to convert David's fallen tabernacle into a figure of the man's house in the moon.

Israel are the people of the realm of the Son of David, who is risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. Depend upon it, the people resemble their King, not only in birth from above, in form, and in character ; for we shall see him as he is, and he will change our vile body like unto his glorious body ; but they will resemble him, also, in rising from the dead, and entering into the liberty of the children of God, through the redemption of the body. All the prophets speak of the return of Israel from the land of their captivity, which is the land of *Hades* ; and of their dwelling in safety under the hand of Messiah, their King. We shall not multiply the proof now, but add what the Spirit says, by the prophet Ezekiel, concerning his restored Israel.

"So shall they be my people, and I will be their God ; and David, my servant, shall be king over them ; and they shall all have one shepherd ; they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob, my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt, and they shall dwell therein, even they and their children, and their children's children forever ; and my servant David shall be their prince forever. Moreover, I will make a covenant of peace with them : it shall be an everlasting covenant with them ; and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them *forevermore*. My tabernacle, also, shall be with them, yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people," Ezek. 37 : 23—27.

This prophecy takes hold of the Beloved One, for the Shepherd and King of this people, and of the land of Jacob for their dwelling place forever : gives them an everlasting covenant of possession, and promise not only to place them, but to place his tabernacle with them, and to be their God, almost in the words of John, the Divine, saying : "Behold,

the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them," in the day that he makes all things new, Rev. 21:3. The scene here described by the two prophets is one, the land is one, the Lord the King is one, and his people Israel are one, gathered out of all nations in the resurrection from the dead, and planted in the heavenly country forever.

One more clause in the Everlasting Covenant with David, descriptive of the people of his realm, deserves notice. They shall move no more; "neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as before time."

The natural Israel suffered affliction at the hand of the Egyptians in cruel bondage; at the hand of Balak, in the wilderness, at the hands of their enemies, on every side, in the land of Canaan, throughout their entire national existence, before and after the time of David. The very names of their deliverers are enough to remind us of the many children of wickedness who afflicted Israel before time: Moses, Joshua, Othniel, Gideon, Barak, Jephtha, Samson, Samuel, and Saul, saved them from the hand of their enemies. Their afflictions, however, did not cease with the publication of this Everlasting Covenant with David their king; but their enemies, from the end of Solomon's reign, troubled Israel in the flesh, more and more, until Shalmaneser, after three centuries, removed the tribes out of their country, never yet to return, and Nebuchadnezzar, one hundred and fifty years later, removed the remaining tribes to Babylon, whence they returned after seventy years, not to the state of peace promised in the covenant, but to afflictions at the hand of their enemies, both greater, more ruinous, and more enduring than "before time;" as the names of the Maccabees, the Syrians, and the Romans; the Saracens, Turks, and Christians will serve to remind the reader.

Does the holy covenant fail, then? By no means, although were the natural Israel intended by the name Israel in the promise, the covenant, so far as we can see, would both fail and become a mockery. For the children of wickedness have delighted to tease, and vex, and slay the natural Israel for the largest part of the time, since they were carried away captive to Assyria and to Babylon, a period of twenty-five hundred years. We must, therefore, give up the name Israel, in the covenant, so far as it applies to the race in the flesh, on account of the total failure of that race, both to keep the holy covenant and to inherit the promised deliver-

ance from the children of wickedness, that they should "not afflict them any more, as before time."

"It was Israel in the flesh, who were afflicted before time:" Was it not the same Israel who, in after time, should escape affliction? We cannot understand it."

In order to surmount the difficulty of reconciling the history of that people with the covenant promises, resort is commonly had to a long future fulfilment of the promise to generations in the flesh, as a sort of compensation for past failures. But there is a better way, which is this: To understand by the name Israel, in the covenant, the resurrection of the just, who are the chosen people; the children of Abraham, because they do the works of Abraham; and the children of Jacob, because they choose the heavenly birth-right for their portion; and "are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection," Luke 20: 36. These are Israel in deed and in truth. Of these the eternal promises in the covenant with his servant David: "I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more;" which place is the promised land of everlasting life; the new earth that God will make.

"There shall the children of wickedness afflict them no more," seeing that sort of people find no entrance into the heavenly country. "There the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest." All people in the flesh are called to endure affliction, whether of the seed of Abraham, or of the house of David, or of the family of Aaron; or of the race of the Gentiles. "As before time," in the holy covenant, refers to the time in the flesh, and in this present evil world, contrasted with the eternity of peace, to the true Israel. "As before time," is not only the time before David, but the entire time of the race of mortals on the earth. The children of wickedness have never ceased to afflict the just, and they never will. "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me, before it hated you," John 15: 18. The faithful are neither planted, nor dwell in a place of their own, nor have a quiet dwelling place, but are continually tossed and shoved about, and spoken against, and troubled with sickness and pain and sorrow of heart, and with sad disappointments, "as before time," from the beginning of the world. This is the lot of the entire race of Adam, not excepting the just, the saints and prophets, apostles and martyrs, and our Anointed King, in his own person.

All this affliction, "as before time," ceases from among his people, when the Covenant Son of David sits upon the throne of David, and rules over the house of Israel forever, in the kingdom that shall have no end. In him, in his throne, and heavenly kingdom, and people Israel, all the covenant promises to David meet, are satisfied and completely fulfilled. There they dwell in "a place of their own, and move no more."

It is said of the promised Son of David: "He shall build me a house," which, in the eyes of the whole world, Solomon, the son of David, performed. But as Solomon was only the visible and present sign of the future and coming Lord, so the temple built by Solomon was not that which shall be, according to the covenant promise, but was only a type in this world, of the temple building of lively stones, in the city whose name is called, "The Lord is there." That temple is the one of which the anointed Son of David is "the chief corner-stone," and the head-stone, and, at the same time, the Master Builder, who gathers into its massive walls, and its polished pillars, and its glorious ornaments, both Jews and Gentiles, of the flesh, who, at one time, "were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world; but now, in Christ Jesus, \* \* \* are made nigh by the blood of Christ, and reconciled unto God, in one body, by the cross; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord, in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."

This holy temple is worthy of the Everlasting Covenant of promise to David; worthy of the power and skill of the Son of God, acknowledged in that covenant; worthy of the habitation of the Eternal on the new earth, and of that holy city, of which saith the Scripture: "I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb, are the temple of it," Rev. 21:22. A spiritual temple, invisible to the natural eye, and incomprehensible to the natural understanding, but none the less real and veritable with Christ in glory. "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God," Rev. 3:12.

This examination of "the Everlasting Covenant" with David, shows, in the parable of Israel, and of the throne of David and of Solomon, and of the temple which Solomon built, a sure promise of King David's greater Son, and his everlasting throne; his wide realm, stretching from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth; his people Israel, the children of God, born of Jerusalem above; and the temple yet building in the holy city, whose walls are salvation, and her gates praise. This is the King, and the realm, and the people, of whom Moses wrote, saying: "There is none like unto the God of Jeshurum, who rideth upon the heaven in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky. The Eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms; and he shall thrust out the enemy from before thee, and shall say: Destroy! Israel shall then dwell in safety alone: the fountain of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and wine; also his heavens shall drop down dew. Happy art thou, O Israel; who is like unto thee, O people, saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency! And thine enemies shall be found liars unto thee; and thou shalt tread upon their high places," Deut. 23: 26.

With this interpretation of the covenant, all the Bible agrees, and especially now the language of the chief priests and Pharisees in solemn counsel, seeing "this man doeth many miracles: and if we let him alone all men will believe on him, and the Romans shall come, and take away both our place and nation." And the high priest answered them: "Ye know nothing at all:" and "he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation, and not for that nation only; but that also he should gather together in one, the children of God, that were scattered abroad," John 11: 47.

This same Jesus, the Covenant Son of David, is also the Christ, the promised seed of Abraham, and the promised seed of the woman, who shall crush the head of the enemy, shall destroy the house of the enemy's kingdom; and shall "make all things new." And then shall be fulfilled the *eternal* promises of the covenant with David, saying: "I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name: and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his Father and he shall be my son. Moreover, I will appoint a place for my people

Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more: neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime."

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### IS THE DOXOLOGY IN MATT. 6:13 AN INTERPOLATION?

1. *Several of the best codices omit it, viz.: B., D., (A. and C. are here deficient,) C. Basiliensis, Griesbach and Wetstein No. 1, C. Bodleianus, Griesbach 118, Graeco-Latin MSS. 17, (Regius) and 130, and Venetian 209, &c.*

2. *Nearly all of these belong to the occidental family, so that the voice of the Western Recension seems to be against it.*

3. *The Latin codices and fathers, unanimously omit it, except a scholiast on Matthew, cited by Augustine, and the Brixian codex. This item of evidence is peculiarly strong, as many of the Latin fathers commented on the prayer, among the earliest of whom are Tertullian and Cyprian. And Jerome seems not to have found it in the gospel of the Nazarenes.*

4. *Alexandrine codices formerly existed which omitted the Doxology, as is evident from the agreement of Origen with the Coptic version. Origen not only commented on the different members of the prayer, except this clause, but also specified particularly, in what respects the manuscripts of Luke (which always omit the Doxology) differ from Matthew. How could he fail to notice this greatest discrepancy, if it really existed in his day? Origen could not have first omitted it, as some have suggested, for Tertullian and Cyprian had already commented upon the prayer without alluding to the Doxology.*

5. *Besides the occidental and Alexandrian codices, there were also others formerly extant, that omitted this clause, as is apparent from some versions, conformed to such codices, and divers assertions of the fathers. It is wanting in some manuscripts and editions of the Arabic version, and in*

Wheeler's Persic version. Neither do Cyrill, of Jernsalem, Gregory Nyssa, Maximus and Caesarius know anything about it. It is true, these codices are not in themselves of much authority, but when their testimony is thrown into the scale with those above-mentioned, it adds to their weight considerably.

6. If this shorter reading, as has been shown, existed originally in the occidental family, and if Origen found it in Alexandrine manuscripts, and others in other manuscripts, it follows,

*a.* That it is confirmed by the testimony of very different witnesses; and,

*b.* That it is extremely ancient.

7. The antiquity of this reading is also proved by Luke. The early manuscripts of Luke were interpolated from Matthew, but this clause was never introduced into Luke. Hence the inference that the very ancient manuscripts of Matthew, from which these interpolations were derived, wanted this Doxology.

8. The clause is contained, it is true, in the three Syriac versions, in the Ethiopic, Armenian, Gothic, in the Apostolical Constitutions, and in Chrysostom. But none of these, except the Peschito, can prove it to be earlier than the fourth century. And even this cannot place its existence, at an earlier period than that, beyond doubt. For many codices of the Peschito were altered, at a later day, to agree with the common Greek text. If we regard the antiquity of the testimony, in regard to which there is no doubt, the shorter reading is certainly the better attested. The Doxology certainly existed about the middle of the fourth century, in certain Greek codices, whence Chrysostom and the author of the Gothic version obtained it. It was probably a plant of Byzantine growth and was transplanted to the provinces, as Bengel remarks.

9. Its introduction may be traced, with great probability, to the *Liturgies*, in which numerous formulas of this character were used. Some of the fathers recite this doxology after the Lord's Prayer; not, however, as a part of the sacred text, but as a liturgical formula. The first rudiments of it we find in the Apostolical Constitutions, where it occurs (7:24) in these words: ὅτι αὐτοὶ εἰσὶν ἡ βασιλεία οὐς τοὺς αἰτίας ἀπεινεῖ; and in another passage (3:8) in its usual form. Some afterwards increased it by new additions. But transcribers gen-

erally seem to have preferred that form of it which the authority of Chrysostom, and other scholiasts, and commentators who followed him, enstamped.

10. That this liturgical appendage should have found its way into so many Greek codices and versions, will not seem strange, if we reflect,

a. That nearly all of these codices belong to the Alexandrian family, and that the Occidental manuscripts differ from them, and that the best representative of the Alexandrian recension (Ephr. Rescript.) is here deficient.

b. That the authority of Chrysostom was extremely great with the Greek transcribers.

c. That at this place a Church lesson ended, and the Greeks were fond of concluding a read section with some such expression. The writers of *lectionaries* (*evangelisteria*) were, moreover, in the habit of appending such phrases as were adapted for liturgical use and most suited to close the reading of the lesson. From these *evangelisteria* and codices, accompanied by the comments, or *scholia*, of Chrysostom, and others, this clause, by degrees, found its way into other books; and this happens the more easily, because,

d. It was so very familiar (from being in the liturgy and in daily use) to the transcribers, who were mostly monks.

Hence we see, too, how it comes that only Matthew had this clause appended to his version of the Lord's Prayer. In Luke neither the *evangelisteria* nor Chrysostom lead the transcribers astray. In early ages, before the shorter formula of Luke had been interpolated from Matthew, the new liturgical appendage was more readily suited to that text which was already the fuller, and which, for this reason, was followed in the liturgical service.

*Αμην* is contained in some of these sources which leave away the doxology, and others read the doxology without the *αμην*, *e. g.*, the Syriac and Armenian versions. Doubtless this had its origin in ecclesiastical usage.

## ARTICLE X.

## NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical, with special reference to Ministers and Students. By John Peter Lange, D. D., in connection with a number of European Divines. Translated from the German, and edited with additions, original and selected. By Philip Schaff, D. D., in connection with American Divines of various evangelical denominations. Vol. II, of the New Testament: containing the Gospel according to Mark, and the Gospel according to Luke. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. The *Review* has already spoken in terms of high commendation of this elaborate and exhaustive Commentary. It may be justly regarded as the great theological enterprise of the present day, combining, as it does, with original investigation the most valuable results of exegetical research, in times past and present, and making them available for the use of ministers and intelligent laymen. The work is equivalent to a well selected library, possessing unusual merit, and no one who desires a critical and thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures, can well do without it. The second volume, both in the original and the translation, has been prepared on the same principles as the first volume, and is marked by the same excellencies. It embraces an exposition of Mark and Luke, the former by Dr. Lange himself, revised from the Edinburgh translation, with additions, by Professor Shedd, and the latter by Dr. Van Oosterzee, of the University of Utrecht, translated from the German, with additions, original and selected, by Drs. Schaff and Starbuck. We are not surprised that the enterprise has met with so much favor, and received the endorsement of the ablest theologians in the country connected with the different evangelical Churches of the land. Scribner & Co., who are issuing so many good works, are entitled to the thanks of the Christian public for presenting the work in a form so improved and attractive.

*An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's Philosophy*: being a defence of Fundamental Truth. By James McCosh, LL. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. The author of this volume is widely and favorably known as a sound and careful thinker, and as a forcible and eloquent writer. The book is not merely an examination of Mill's Philosophy; whilst it exposes the mistakes and inconsistencies of Mill's attack on Hamilton, it also reviews the positions taken by other authors, and criticises some of the leading views of Hamilton himself. He maintains that Sir William Hamilton was never able to weld into a consistent whole, the realistic matter he received from Reid, and the subjective forms he adopted from Kant. We do not express an opinion in reference to the systems represented by these three champions. There are difficulties connected with the adoption of Hamilton's views, still greater in the adoption of Mill's, and we are not prepared to say that McCosh has entirely solved all difficulties. But we commend the work to all who are interested in metaphysical discussions.

*Prophecy*: Viewed in respect to its Distinctive Nature, special function and proper interpretation. By Patrick Fairbairn, Principal of the Free Church, Glasgow. New York: Carlton & Porter. The subject of Prophecy, always interesting to the Christian, awakens increased attention as the plans of Providence unfold themselves in human history. No author discusses the subject with greater ability and thoroughness than Dr. Fairbairn, and although we may not be able accept all his interpretations of specific prophecies as infallible, we welcome the work as an instructive guide, a valuable addition to the literature of prophecy, and a useful contribution to the study of theology. The author manifests no sympathy with what are denominated millenarian views of the prophecies. He does not profess to be able to designate the time of the overthrow of Popery, or the dissolution of the world.

*The Restoration*: Or, the Hope of the Early Church realized. By Henry A. Reiley. With an Introduction. By J. A. Seiss, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. This volume is devoted to the advocacy of premillenarian views, to the literal restoration of the Jews, and the personal advent and reign of Christ. Dr. Seiss, who sympathizes in sentiment with the author, and has, also, written very largely on the subject, says: "The work is full of important truths, fairly deduced, popularly presented, and suitably enforced. The honest seeker after the truth, who has not found it on these topics, will find this book a valuable help to settle and satisfy his mind, and to open to him the proper grandeur and joyousness of the *Redemption that is in Jesus Christ*."

*Jehovah-Jireh*: A Treatise on Providence. By W. S. Plumer, D. D. LL. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. This is not a work of great erudition, or strictly theological in its character, but a practical exposition of the subject, aptly illustrated, and written in a manner adapted to edify and comfort the reader, and with the earnestness and force, characteristic of all Dr. Plumer's productions.

*The Scripture Law of Divorce*. By Alvah Hovey, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Newton Theological Seminary. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. This discussion, written at the request of an ecclesiastical council, is a clear and conclusive exhibition of the subject, assuming the position that there is but one proper ground of divorce, and that the Christian Church ought to recognize in their discipline no other cause as valid.

*Daily Meditations*. By Rev. George Bowen, American Missionary, Bombay, India. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee. This work has been pronounced by competent judges, such men as Dr. Williams and Skinner, as unequalled by books of its class. The author has been a missionary in India, for the last nineteen years, and seems to be an earnest and single-hearted Christian. The Meditations are marked by originality, freshness and directness, and are worthy the attention of those who desire a clearer insight into the Scriptures, a deeper Christian experience, and an increase of faith and love.

*The Life of the Rev. Robert Baird, D. D.* By his son, Henry M. Baird, Professor in the University of New York. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. Few men have been more useful than Dr. Baird. From the time that he first entered the ministry, his earnest and philanthropic labors were devoted with intelligent zeal to the interests of religion and the improvement of society. For many years he was in the service of the American and Foreign Christian Union, and in this connection was well known, at home and abroad. He visited Europe nine times, and

probably no private citizen ever enjoyed the same social advantages and experiences in Great Britain and on the Continent. His courteous manners, his evangelical views and earnest piety, secured for him admission into the most refined circles. The simple facts of his useful and honorable life, necessarily contain a vast amount of interesting matter, and the record is faithfully drawn—not exaggerated or overdone—by an affectionate son. The book is beautifully printed and gives an admirable likeness of the subject.

*The Life of John Brainerd*, the Brother of David Brainerd and his successor as Missionary to the Indians of New Jersey. By Thomas Brainerd, D. D., Pastor of the "Old Pine Street Church," Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee. This is a most valuable addition to our biographical literature. It is not only a well-written Memoir of a devoted, self-sacrificing and successful minister of the gospel, but it abounds in the most interesting and satisfactory information relative to early missionary effort among the Indians, and of Christian life and culture in this country more than a century ago.

*Life of Benjamin Silliman, M. D., LL. D.* Late Professor of Chemistry, Mineralogy and Geology in Yale College. Chiefly from Manuscript Reminiscences, Diaries and Correspondence. By George P. Fisher, Professor in Yale College. In Two Volumes. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. Professor Fisher has succeeded in compiling a most interesting and instructive history of the eminent Professor of Yale College, who, in green old age, has so recently passed away from the active duties of life. The narrative is most skillfully presented in judicious and copious selections from his own reminiscences, journals and letters, and contains, not only a personal history of the subject of the Memoir, but the record of the Institution with whose interests he was identified, and a review of the scientific and political progress of the country, for the last half century.

*Temperance Recollections. Labors, Defeats, Triumphs. An Autobiography.* By John Marsh, D. D., Secretary of the First Three National Temperance Conventions, and Thirty Years Corresponding Secretary and Editor of the American Temperance Union. New York: 1866. We have read this volume with deep interest. It abounds in interesting and important facts, in arguments and suggestions, by a faithful veteran in the service; one who was closely identified with the Reformation, from the very beginning of its history. The book may be considered an authentic record, and of permanent value to those who desire information on the Temperance question.

*The Works of Philip Lindsley, D. D.* Formerly Vice President and President elect, of the College of New Jersey; and late President of the University of Nashville, Tenn. Edited by Le Roy J. Halsey, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the North-West. With Introductory Notes of his Life and Labors. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. This work, so beautifully printed, consists of three volumes. The first is devoted to Educational Discourses, the second, to Sermons and Religious Discourses, and the third, to Miscellaneous Discourses and Essays. The discussions contain the results of long-continued thought and the varied studies of the author. They are a monument of his learning and zeal, and of his ardent devotion and untiring efforts in the cause of education. They possess a permanent historical value, and illustrate the progress of education in our country.

*Inner Rome: Political, Religious and Social.* By Rev. C. M. Butler,

D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Divinity School, Phil. &c. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. This work communicates information, not found in the many books on the same subject. It gives more of the inner character of the country and the people, the government and administration, the religious and social state of Rome, of the workings of the Papacy, and its sad results. The author's facilities for gaining knowledge were most favorable.

*The Living Temple: or, Scripture Views of the Church.* By John S. Stone, D. D. Griswold Lecturer in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in Philadelphia. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. The work here offered to the public, embodies the substance, carefully revised, somewhat enlarged and modified, of a discussion published by the author some years ago, under the title of the "Church Universal." The design of the book is to unfold the Scriptural idea of the Church, and the discussion is embraced in three portions: (1) The Church, as a spiritual body; (2) The Church as a visible body; (3) The well-being of the visible Church. The Church, in the estimation of the author, comprises all, of whatever age or country, of whatever name or connection, who hold the truth of Christ, in the main, whole and uncorrupt, and are saved by him from sin and everlasting death, a communion of saints, who have a common union with Christ in his truth, his life and his salvation. Whilst the author shows the proper attachment to his own Church, he is free from all arrogant pretensions and narrow sectarianism; the positions are catholic and the spirit admirable. The discussion is permeated with so much Christian love, that its circulation cannot fail to do good.

*Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker, Minister of the Twenty-Eighth Congregationalist Society, Boston.* By John Weiss. In Two Volumes. New York: D. Appleton & Co. These volumes have been prepared by a warm friend and ardent disciple of the subject, and he has done his work well. But whilst there are many things in the writings of Theodore Parker, which we read with intense interest, and highly approve, yet much that he has written is in direct and open antagonism with Christianity. He represents the views and tendencies of an influential party who do not recognize the Christ of the New Testament, who reject the vital points of the Christian system, and take ground in opposition to the testimony of Jesus. His acknowledged ability, his scholarly aims, the clearness and force with which he presents his opinions, his tender sensibilities, his large-hearted kindness, and his brave and noble utterances, make him only the more dangerous teacher, and his power for mischief the greater.

*The Idle Word: Short religious Essays from the Gift of Speech, and its employment in Conversation.* By Edward M. Goulburn, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Every additional treatise from the pen of Dr. Goulburn satisfies us of his qualifications to discuss practical truth. His books are full of instruction, written in a servid, earnest spirit, and adapted to the promotion of personal piety.

*The Women of Methodism: Its Three Foundresses, Susanna Wesley, The Countess of Huntingdon and Barbara Heck; with sketches of their Female Associates and Successors in the early history of the denomination.* By Abel Stevens, LL. D. New York: Carlton & Porter. The title of the book sufficiently explains its design, and the historical stu-

dies of the author eminently fit him for the preparation of this special chapter in the general history of Methodism. Some of the reminiscences, so graphically given, it is said, have never before been published in this country.

*Worship in the School-Room.* A Manual of Devotion, especially for the School, also adapted to the Family. By Rev. W. T. Wylie. New York: Schermerhorn, Bancroft & Co. This attractive Manual will satisfactorily meet the public expectations, excited by previous announcements. It is complete for the object intended, containing two hundred and twenty-four lessons, each one of which consists of appropriate Scriptural passages, illustrative of some important truth, accompanied with a suitable Hymn, set to music, and a prayer adapted to the special subject presented. The prayers, breathing a most excellent spirit, have been prepared, at the particular request of the Editor, by individuals representing no less than thirteen evangelical denominations of Christians. Contributions to the work, from our own Church, have been furnished by Drs. Schmucker, Schaeffer, Harkey, Pohlman, Seiss, Krauth, Rev. Messrs. Titus, Baugher, Bickel, Sheeleigh, and the Editor of the *Review*.

*Natural Theology.* By William Paley, D. D. *Horae Paulinae: Or, The Truth of the Scripture History of St. Paul evinced by a comparison of the Epistles which bear his name, with the Acts of the Apostles, and with one another.* By William Paley, D. D. American Tract Society. This is a beautiful edition of these standard works, bound in one volume, so admirably adapted to school purposes. The American Tract Society is rendering the Church and country most important service.

*Praying and Working:* Being some account of what men can do when in earnest. By Rev. W. F. Stevenson, Dublin. New York: Carter & Bros. This book, written in a graphic, sprightly style, shows what Christian men have accomplished when earnestly engaged in their work. It furnishes interesting sketches of Falk, Wichern, Fliedner, Gossner and Harms, and is adapted to assist and encourage those who are desirous of being useful.

*The Wycliffites: or England in the Fifteenth Century.* By Mrs. Colonel Mackay. New York: Carter & Bros. The design of the volume is to illustrate the principles of the English Reformer, and the influence they exercised after his death. The perils to which his followers were exposed, and the heroism with which they encountered opposition and danger, enhance the interest of the narrative. Although the book is defective in its unnecessary repetitions, it will do good.

*Rescued From Egypt.* By A. L. O. E. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons. The incidents in the life of Moses, presented in a series of Lectures, are most skilfully interwoven with a most touching story, connected with English society, told with no little dramatic power. The temptations of the world, the sacrifices of bright prospects in life for Christian principle, and the providential deliverance from threatened want, are calculated to produce an impression upon the youthful mind.

*The Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell, Afterwards Mistress Milton.* New York: M. W. Dodd. This is a new edition of a work which has been very much admired, printed in antique style, and written with much discrimination and skill, and in the quaint language of the seventeenth century. Mary Powell, the wife of John Milton, is supposed to write her own Diary, and thus is presented the domestic life of her husband, and that of many of his friends.

*Cherry and Violet: A Tale of the Great Plague.* New York: M. W. Dodd. This is a beautiful story, by the author of "Mary Powell," illustrative of the domestic affections. It is full of delicate touches, connected with suffering and self-sacrificing fidelity. Its religious teachings are good. It is an excellent book for the family and for the Sunday School.

*The Seven Great Hymns of the Medieval Church.* New York: Anson D. F. Randolph. The volume contains "The Celestial Country," "Dies Irae," "Stabat Mater," "Veni Sancte Spiritus," "Veni Creator Spiritus," "Veniila Regis," "The Alleluia Sequence," so well known and so much admired. The mechanical execution of the book is beautiful and deserves high praise.

*Hymns for the Sick Room.* New York: A. D. F. Randolph. These Hymns, so judiciously selected, are accompanied with an appropriate text of Scripture and a beautiful thought, from some eminent writer. They form a volume of one hundred and twenty-six pages, printed in a very attractive style, and admirably adapted to the purpose intended.

*The Great Cities of Bashan: and Syria's Holy Places.* By Rev. F. L. Porter, A. M. New York: T. Nelson & Sons. Mr. Porter's narrative has attracted more attention than any other book of travels of a similar character, lately published. It is strikingly original. Passing by familiar localities, the author describes places seldom visited by the traveller, and furnishes investigations of regions, hitherto unexplored. The truthfulness of prophecy is illustrated, and a vivid picture given of scenes, described in the life of the Saviour. The book is exceedingly engaging and instructive.

*The History of Henry the Fifth: King of England, Lord of Ireland and Heir of France.* By George M. Towle. Author of "Glimpses of History." The author has chosen a very important field for his investigations, and a character whose personal history is full of interest. It is the transition period of modern society, when Europe was passing from the feudal to the monarchical system, and a fierce conflict of ideas prevailed. Henry's influence was all-powerful, and his personal beauty, his youthful character, his mental and moral qualities, his noble bearing and lofty purpose, give a peculiar charm to the history.

*A Text Book on Anatomy, Physiology and Hygiene.* For the use of Schools and Families. By John C. Draper, M. D., Professor of Natural History and Physiology in the New York Free Academy, and Professor of Analytical Chemistry in the University of New York. With one hundred and seventy illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. The value of so luminous and complete a text-book, prepared by one, so well qualified for the task, cannot be overestimated. Here are given the latest results of science, the facts and theories actually needed for ordinary instruction, well-arranged and clearly presented, in a form popular and scientific. The directions of the author for the preservation of our health, and the suggestions for the prevention of the Cholera, are worthy of consideration.

*Elements of Political Economy.* By Arthur Latham Perry, Professor of History and Political Economy, in Williams College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. A compendious exhibition of the principles of the Science is here presented in logical order, and in a familiar but elevated style, with ample illustrations, derived from intelligible and

interesting sources. Although we cannot endorse all the conclusions of the author, we regard the work as one of great merit.

*Sower, Barnes & Potts* are publishing a number of most excellent Text-Books, worthy of the attention of those who are engaged as educators in the different departments of instruction. Sheppard's Constitutional Text-Book, is an excellent, practical and familiar exposition of the Constitution of the United States; also the First Book of the Constitution, by the same author. Bouvier's Familiar Astronomy, Peterson's Familiar Science, Brooks' Elementary Geometry, Hillside's Compend of Geology, are highly endorsed, and recommended by some of the most experienced teachers in the country.

*The Daily Public School in the United States.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. There is no one in the country whose views on the subject of education, deserve more careful consideration than the author of this discussion. Although we may differ from him in some of his opinions, we are grateful for the valuable information and suggestions communicated, the result of experience and observation, which are worthy the examination of all who are interested in our educational systems.

*Battle-Echoes: Or, Lessons from the War.* By George B. Ide, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. The discussions, contained in the present volume, were occasioned by the events of the late War for the preservation of the National Union, and were written during the progress of that struggle. They are intensely patriotic, and breathe a deeply religious fervor. Some of the chapters are of an absorbing and permanent interest, and of high literary merit.

*Notes on the History of Slavery in Massachusetts.* By George H. Moore, Librarian of the New York Historical Society. New York: D. Appleton & Co. This volume is full of curious details, the result of Mr. Moore's careful research, and will be read with interest.

*James Louis Petigru. A Biographical Sketch.* By William J. Grayson. New York: Harper & Brothers. The chief interest which attaches to this Memoir, is in the refusal of its gifted and loyal subject to give in his adhesion to the Rebellion, and in the high estimation in which he continued to be held by the citizens of Charleston. He was not only left undisturbed, notwithstanding the knowledge of his opinions, but was even chosen to codify the State laws. He died in 1863. The volume is a valuable contribution to the political and social history of the Civil War.

*War of the Rebellion: Or, Scylla and Charybdis; consisting of observations upon the causes, course and consequences of the late Civil War in the United States.* By H. S. Foote. New York: Harper & Brothers. Mr. Foote was born in the South and resided, at different periods, in the North. Until about a year before the close of the War, he was a Representative in the Rebel Congress, from the State of Tennessee. He is a vigorous and independent thinker, and his style of writing is bold and spirited, although sometimes inflated. Whilst many of his views are not very sound, his book sheds much light on some important events, and the last two chapters give us inside glimpses into the condition of things in the Southern Confederacy.

*Mr. Buchanan's Administration on the Eve of the Rebellion.* New York: D. Appleton & Co. The title of the book explains its scope. Its principal object is to present, from the author's stand-point, a sketch of the antecedents ending in the late Rebellion. Much of the material

is made up from documentary sources, and will be of service to the future historian of the times. Our motto is, *Altera pars et audiatur*, and no matter how much a man may differ from us in sentiment, or how greatly he may, in our judgment, have erred, he has a right to be heard.

*The Wrong of Slavery, the Right of Emancipation and the Future of the African Race in the United States.* By Robert Dale Owen. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1864. The author, in a very readable form, brings together the facts and the law which relate to our present condition as a nation, and presents historical documents and statistics upon which are based the most important deductions.

*My New Home.* By the Author of "Win and Wear," "Faithful and True," etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. What a good service the Carters are doing in the many excellent works which they are continually sending from their press for the young. The story before us is well told, the characters are natural and the lessons taught important and useful.

*Egypt's Princes.* A Narrative of Missionary Labor in the Valley of the Nile. By Rev. Gulian Lansing, Missionary of the United Presbyterian Church in Egypt. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. This is a very interesting book, a useful contribution to the literature of Egypt, furnishing, as it does, much information relative to the country and the character and customs of the people, not found in other books, with a large amount of stirring narrative and personal adventure. A faithful account of the result of missionary labor and the success of the gospel, is also given.

*Altar Incense.* Being Morning Watches, Evening Incense, and Altar Stones: A Memorial of Devotion for Morning and Evening. By the Author of the "Faithful Promiser," "Words of Jesus," *Memories of Gennesaret.* New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. This is an interesting addition to our devotional literature, similar to Bogatsky's "Golden Treasury," and similar works, and may be used as a manual. In the hymns, which are incorporated in the volume, words and scenes of sacred association have been made suggestive of profitable thought for each day of the month.

*From Dan to Beersheba: or the Land of Promise, as it now appears.* Including a description of the boundaries, topography, agriculture, antiquities, cities and present inhabitants of that wonderful land, with illustrations of the remarkable accuracy of the sacred writers, in their allusions to their native country. Maps and Engravings. By Rev. J. P. Newman, D. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. Dr. Newman, who writes with a lively, glowing pen, left Rome for the East in 1861, with two other clergymen as companions in his tour, and here describes the result of his observations and impressions, for the purpose of illustrating the fidelity with which the inspired writers uttered their prophecies and recorded the facts of sacred history.

*Principles of Zoology,* touching the structure, development, distribution and natural arrangement of the races of animals, living and extinct. With numerous Illustrations. Part I. Comparative Physiology. By Louis Agassiz and A. A. Gould. Revised Edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. The object of the work is to furnish an epitome of the leading facts and principles of the Science of Zoölogy, so illustrated as to be intelligible to the beginner, and to produce more enlarged ideas of man's relations to nature, and more exalted conceptions of the plan of

creation and its Great Author. It is a very convenient Manual for Schools and Colleges.

*Louis Napoleon, the destined Monarch of the World, and Personal Antichrist foreshown in Prophecy, to comprise a Seven Years' Covenant about; or soon after, 1864-5, and (after the resurrection and translation of the wise virgins has taken place two years and from four to six weeks after the Covenant,) subsequently to become completely supreme over England and most of America, and Christendom, and fiercely to persecute Christians during the latter half of the seven years, until he finally perishes at the descent of Christ at the Battle of Armageddon, about, or soon after, 1872-3.* By Rev. M. Baxter, late Missionary of the Episcopal Church, at Onadaga, C. W. Philadelphia: James S. Claxton. The object of the work is sufficiently indicated by the extended title. The Rev. Dr. Seiss, of Philadelphia, is frequently and favorably referred to in the discussions of the work.

*The Rebellion Record, A Diary of American Events.* Edited by Frank Moore. New York: D. Van Nostrand. Part LVI of this important publication, contains much material, not only for present reading, but for future reference, and is embellished with fine steel engravings of Generals Trobriand and Franklin.

*Harper's Pictorial History of the Great Rebellion.* This valuable serial has reached the 16th No., and completes the Peninsular Campaign of 1862. Its typographical beauty and richness of illustration, make it exceedingly attractive. As a popular history, the work must meet with success.

*Harper's New Monthly Magazine.* No. 194. July 1866. Harper, for this number, contains a number of interesting papers. "Personal Recollections of the War," "Some Curious Homes," "Education of the Colored Population in Louisiana," "Francis Asbury," are articles pleasant to read. "The Monthly Record of Current Events," is prepared with much care, and will be valuable for reference, years to come.

*Hours at Home:* A Popular Monthly, devoted to Religious and Useful Literature. Edited by J. M. Sherwood. This excellent Magazine sustains the high character which it promised at the beginning. Without being exclusively religious, it is pervaded by a lofty moral tone and has strong claims upon the patrons of a pure and elevated literature. The contents of the July number are varied, and equal in literary ability to any of its predecessors.

*The Apocalypse.* A Series of Special Lectures on the Revelation of Jesus Christ, with Revised Text. By J. A. Seiss, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. This is the second issue of this publication, embracing the eighth Lecture, and bringing the exposition down to the fourth chapter of Revelation.

*The Glad Disciples:* A Sermon preached March 18th, 1866. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D.

*Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost:* A Sermon preached March 4th, 1866. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D.

*Funeral Discourse.* Delivered by Henry N. Pohlman, D. D., of Albany, N. Y., on occasion of the funeral Ceremonies of Rev. Dr. Wackerhagen, delivered in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, at Germantown, Columbia County, N. Y., Nov. 4th, 1865. Albany: Van Beuthuysens.

## CONTENTS OF NO. LXVII.

Article.	Page.
I. BAPTISM,.....	309
By Prof. CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D. D., Philadelphia.	
II. THE LORD'S SUPPER. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF LUTHER,.....	369
By Prof. C. W. SCHAEFFER, D. D., Germantown, Pa.	
III. THE ATONEMENT,.....	372
By Rev. CHARLES A. STORK, A. M., Baltimore, Md.	
IV. THE SCRIPTURAL IDEA OF THE MINISTRY. TRANS- LATED FROM THE GERMAN OF PROF. DR. PLITT, OF BONN,.....	381
By Rev. J. D. SEVERINGHAUS, A. M., Richmond, Indiana.	
V. REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINIS- TERS, .....	390
VI. AT WHAT AGE SHOULD THE YOUNG BE CON- FIRMED ? .....	402
By Prof. H. HARBAUGH, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.	
VII. THE LOST BOOKS MENTIONED IN THE OLD TES- TAMENT,.....	417
By JAMES MACFARLANE, A. M., Towanda, Pa.	
VIII. THE EVERLASTING COVENANT OF PROMISE TO DAVID,.....	426
By Rev. HENRY DANA WARD, Philadelphia.	
IX. IS THE DOXOLOGY IN MATT. 6 : 13 AN INTERPO- LATION ? .....	447
X. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,.....	450

The *Evangelical Review* for January, opens with an elaborate and learned article on "Christ's Descent into Hell." Mr. Valentine's "Essential Principle of Reform" is not only sensible and thoughtful, as all that he writes is, but it has a vivacity and vim which relieves it of the heaviness, almost universally characteristic of didactic essays. Dr. Conrad's article is the ablest thing he has ever published. The exposition of Matt. 7:6, states the objections to the ordinary view, and presents another very good one. Dr. Allibone gives us, in his account of the Critical Review, one of those delightful dishes of literary gossip, in whose compounding he has no superior.—*Lutheran & Missionary*.

The April number of the *Evangelical Quarterly Review* has just come to hand. We cannot refrain from expressing our gratification at seeing this excellent number. Professor Stoever deserves the gratitude of the whole Church for his untiring labor to furnish a *Quarterly* worthy of the Lutheran Church of this country. His industry, perseverance, hopefulness amid difficulties and discouragements, his good sense and sound judgment, his catholic Lutheranism, standing aloof from all party movements in the Church, soothing asperities and healing difficulties between brethren of the same Lutheran name—his efforts to unite all the portions and fragments of our Zion into one great body; his genial spirit; and correct literary taste, have fitted him pre-eminently for the post of Editor of our *Quarterly Review*. This last number is peculiarly rich in its contents. Nearly all the articles are written by well-known and able men. Most of them are by Lutheran ministers, and there is not an inferior paper among them.—*Lutheran Observer*.

We always read this *Quarterly*, and many of its articles we read with pleasure and profit.—*Lutheran Standard*.

The *Review* is published in the interest of the Lutheran Church. The number before us contains eight articles, full of thought and learning.—*Christian Standard, Cleveland, O.*

The *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, for April discusses a variety of important questions.—*The Independent, (N. Y.)*

The *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, for April, gives us a series of instructive and valuable articles. The article on the Discovery of the Law of Gravitation, by Prof. Duffield, of Princeton, gives us the romance of Science, especially in its sketch of the investigations of Kepler and Newton. The second article by Dr. M'Cron, of Baltimore, is quite eloquent.—*The Evangelist, (N. Y.)*

The April number of this *Quarterly* presents more than the usual variety of interesting articles.—*Ger. Ref. Messenger*.